

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) authorizing the President to restore Clayton J. Bailey to his position and rank as a first lieutenant in Twenty-eighth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREING: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jasper Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Howard & Spivey, of the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKETT: Papers to accompanying House bill granting a pension to Moses Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of J. J. Thames and other druggists of Taylor, Tex., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the University of Texas, urging the establishment of a national standards bureau—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension Association, in favor of Senate bill No. 1170, to pension ex-slaves—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Petitions of the California Club and citizens of the State of California, urging the acquisition of the Calaveras Grove of Sequoias, and the preservation of the big trees, to accompany House bill No. 11000—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of the twenty-ninth session of the Illinois Association of Mexican War Veterans, Taylorsville, Ill., for increase of pension for services in war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolutions of Wheeler Post, No. 98, of Versailles, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Presbyterian Church of Hanover, and the Baptist Church of Levi, Ind., urging the enactment of the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Paper to accompany House bill No. 5147, to correct the military record of John A. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of retail druggists of San Francisco, Cal., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Produce Exchange, urging the repeal of the tax of 2 cents on checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted at a meeting of German-American societies in Cleveland, Ohio, urging the Government to use its friendly offices to bring about a cessation of hostilities between Great Britain and the South African Republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Branch No. 157, of Philadelphia, National Association of Letter Carriers, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4911, equalizing the salaries of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, letter of J. W. Dampman, in behalf of Maj. Gen. Alexander S. Webb, of New York, for his reinstatement on the military retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, in favor of Senate amendments to House bill No. 8347, restoring the appropriations for the maintenance of the Hydrographic Office—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Forest City Lodge, No. 10, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Cleveland, Ohio, against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Sea Gull Specialty Company, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of section 7 of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Winchester, Mass., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolution of the Commercial Club of South Omaha, Nebr., in reference to House bill No. 887, relating to the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of G. Manuel and other druggists of Rochester, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTEY: Papers relating to the claim of Albert F. May, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of druggists of Burlington, Vt.,

for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sudley, Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of certain churches and societies of Potlstown, Bradford, and Bloomsburg, Pa., asking for the passage of the anti-canteen bill, prohibiting the sale of liquors on premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Charlotte E. Baird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TONGUE: Petitions of the Christian Church and Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Cottage Grove, Lane County, Oreg., urging the enactment of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATERS: Petition of the First Baptist Church, of Redlands, Cal., asking for the passage of the anti-canteen bill, prohibiting the sale of liquors on premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of John Lucas & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., for the reclamation of arid lands and increasing the appropriation to the Hydrographic and Geological Survey—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 1, 1900.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will, without objection, stand approved.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING PORTO RICO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, stating that the governor of Porto Rico has communicated to the President a suggestion that pending legislation in Congress affecting matters in that island should at once be referred therein order that the civil government may advise the lawmaking branch as to the possible bearing of such legislation; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, calling attention to the very great importance of having legislative action upon the agreement between the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes and the Cherokee tribe of Indians, and also upon the agreement negotiated between the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes and the Muscogee or Creek tribe of Indians, etc.; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and ordered to be printed.

MAJ. W. L. FISK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, submitting a communication from Maj. W. L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, presenting certain facts pertaining to disallowances by the Auditor for the War Department in the settlement of his accounts, aggregating \$116.15; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONFEDERATE CEMETERY AT CAMP CHASE, OHIO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General of the Army, submitting a communication from Capt. R. B. Turner, Sixth Infantry, quartermaster at Columbus Barracks, Ohio, relative to the rebuilding of the stone wall and iron gate inclosing the Confederate burial ground at Camp Chase, Ohio; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WILLIAM L. DUGGER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William L. Dugger vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 269) granting a pension to Rosa G. Thompson, formerly Rosa G. Edwards;

A bill (H. R. 315) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Taber;
 A bill (H. R. 437) granting a pension to Mary E. Reynolds;
 A bill (H. R. 504) granting an increase of pension to William T. Lowry;
 A bill (H. R. 1204) granting a pension to Martha McSwain;
 A bill (H. R. 1288) granting a pension to Cornelius W. Roberts;
 A bill (H. R. 1734) granting a pension to Mary A. Whitmore;
 A bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to Julia E. G. Lewis;
 A bill (H. R. 1990) granting a pension to Julia A. Heath;
 A bill (H. R. 2362) granting a pension to Bethuel H. Brasted;
 A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Andrew Jackson;
 A bill (H. R. 2849) granting a pension to Mary A. Hanson;
 A bill (H. R. 3089) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Pond;
 A bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hartley;
 A bill (H. R. 3861) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Millard;
 A bill (H. R. 4069) granting a pension to Julia A. Kinkead;
 A bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Sarah Parrish;
 A bill (H. R. 4679) granting a pension to Micager Philpot;
 A bill (H. R. 4800) granting a pension to Joseph Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to D. Cyrus Holdridge;
 A bill (H. R. 4986) granting an increase of pension to William P. Aylesworth;
 A bill (H. R. 5007) granting an increase of pension to Smith Miner;
 A bill (H. R. 5117) granting a pension to Roland Burnett;
 A bill (H. R. 5120) granting an increase of pension to John S. Coggeshall;
 A bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to William Love;
 A bill (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Mary E. Dickey;
 A bill (H. R. 5444) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Brush;
 A bill (H. R. 5644) granting an increase of pension to Charles Alfred De Arnaud;
 A bill (H. R. 5648) granting a pension to Mary B. Allen;
 A bill (H. R. 5894) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Townsend;
 A bill (H. R. 5944) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Everly;
 A bill (H. R. 6096) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Kirkendall;
 A bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to Michael S. Brockett;
 A bill (H. R. 6776) granting a pension to Annie Chamberlain;
 A bill (H. R. 6854) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Kellogg;
 A bill (H. R. 6902) granting a pension to Lydia A. Tryon;
 A bill (H. R. 6947) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Rembaugh;
 A bill (H. R. 7012) granting a pension to Emma C. Stephenson;
 A bill (H. R. 7158) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Parrott;
 A bill (H. R. 7159) granting an increase of pension to Wesley C. Sawyer;
 A bill (H. R. 7179) granting a pension to Clarence S. Hall;
 A bill (H. R. 7190) granting an increase of pension to George O. Cole;
 A bill (H. R. 7327) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Paine;
 A bill (H. R. 7328) granting an increase of pension to John Nicklin;
 A bill (H. R. 7329) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Swenson;
 A bill (H. R. 7553) granting an increase of pension to Fannie M. O'Linn;
 A bill (H. R. 7600) granting an increase of pension to Charles Claussen;
 A bill (H. R. 7621) granting a pension to William H. Chapman;
 A bill (H. R. 7714) granting a pension to Sarah M. Leslie;
 A bill (H. R. 8141) granting a pension to Sarah J. Peddycoart;
 A bill (H. R. 8207) granting a pension to Joseph Quinn;
 A bill (H. R. 8218) granting a pension to Mary E. Lacey;
 A bill (H. R. 8254) granting an increase of pension to Marie L. Apgar;
 A bill (H. R. 8540) granting a pension to Lydia J. De Silva;
 A bill (H. R. 8689) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hoyt;
 A bill (H. R. 8735) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Sharrard;
 A bill (H. R. 9010) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Westfield;
 A bill (H. R. 9043) granting an increase of pension to David S. Snyder;

A bill (H. R. 9108) granting a pension to Maria H. Hixon;
 A bill (H. R. 9176) granting a pension to Emily Haines Harrison;
 A bill (H. R. 9378) granting a pension to Irving Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 9502) granting an increase of pension to Phebe A. La Mott;
 A bill (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Briggeman;
 A bill (H. R. 9719) granting a pension to Amos W. Felker;
 A bill (H. R. 9783) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dennis;
 A bill (H. R. 9839) granting an increase of pension to Emily H. Wood;
 A bill (H. R. 10029) granting a pension to Elizabeth Springer;
 A bill (H. R. 10062) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Crottsenburg;
 A bill (H. R. 10235) granting an increase of pension to George Friend;
 A bill (H. R. 10381) granting an increase of pension to Gideon W. T. Ridlon;
 A bill (H. R. 10524) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Riden;
 A bill (H. R. 10607) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Disbrow;
 A bill (H. R. 10618) granting an increase of pension to Martin O'Connor;
 A bill (H. R. 10742) granting a pension to Wilburn W. Testerman;
 A bill (H. R. 10749) granting a pension to Henry L. White;
 A bill (H. R. 10750) granting a pension to James H. Rainey;
 A bill (H. R. 10758) granting a pension to Sallie B. Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram;
 A bill (H. R. 10778) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Winkler;
 A bill (H. R. 10815) granting a pension to Lucius K. Smalling;
 A bill (H. R. 10834) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dempsey;
 A bill (H. R. 10847) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Summers;
 A bill (H. R. 10856) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robinson;
 A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Buehler;
 A bill (H. R. 10873) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Peixotte;
 A bill (H. R. 10912) granting an increase of pension to John Whitmore;
 A bill (H. R. 11010) granting an increase of pension to James H. Eastman; and
 A bill (H. R. 11145) granting a pension to William C. Chandler.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3598) to amend an act granting to the Muscle Shoals Power Company right to erect and construct canal and power stations at Muscle Shoals, Alabama.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2826) authorizing and requiring certain extensions to be made to the lines of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2581) to incorporate the National White Cross of America, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MUDD, Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, and Mr. SIMS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10308) to extend to certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mails, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LOUD, Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, and Mr. GRIGGS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 4108) granting an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk;

A bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of Robert Smalls; and

A bill (H. R. 11283) to establish Calais, in the State of Maine, as a subport of entry, and to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the ports of Eastport and Calais, in the State of Maine.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN INDIA.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a petition signed by the chief justice of the supreme court of California, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, a member of the University of California, the chairman of the committee on organization of the Oakland Peace Society, and many other representative citizens of California, praying that an appropriation be made by Congress of a large sum of money for the relief of the famishing people of India.

I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, for the reason that I am not in the possession of sufficient data whereby I may prepare a preamble and joint resolution providing that Congress shall make this appropriation.

Some two years ago, February 13, 1897, I think, at the request of the people west of the Missouri River, from the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa, I asked the Government to provide a ship for transporting some three or four thousand tons of breadstuffs that had been contributed by the people of those States to the famishing people of India. The Government transported the provisions free of charge, and the good people of the States named made those donations.

No official acknowledgment of which I have any information has ever been presented to Congress or to the President. Therefore I should hesitate in pressing such a measure at this time, thinking it possible, perhaps, that Great Britain might not look with favor upon our action in sending unsolicited donations to India, as she did not look with favor upon our proffer of friendship as a peace mediator in South Africa.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me right there ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I think the world has been horrified, almost stupefied, by the suffering that is now being endured in India, the chief and greatest of England's colonies. The ravage of the pestilence and the famine there is something that appalls the imagination. Whole families are found dead, the babe lying by its dead mother; whole districts are devastated.

Now, the Senator comes in here, as he has a right to do, with a proposition to invoke assistance from the United States for those starving people. That is a worthy and merciful end. But I rose to ask the Senator what the great British Government has done for those people. That Government is spending tens and hundreds of millions of dollars in breaking down and destroying republics. The premier himself in his last speech declared that the last shred of independence must be taken from the South African Republics. It is the most brutal manifesto of tyranny and strength against liberty and weakness that the world has seen.

I am moved, under these conditions, to ask the Senator what England is doing to relieve her own subjects? I do not see in all the meetings and all the demonstrations in Great Britain, which are all in relation to the suppression of the Boer Republic and the other South African Republic, any mention of the terrible sufferings that the subjects of England are enduring in India. Therefore I ask the Senator what he has in the way of information as to what Great Britain is doing when she is spending hundreds of millions of dollars in her war?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, what is the subject before the Senate?

Mr. PERKINS. I have presented a petition.

Mr. ALDRICH. I raise a question of order. I ask for the regular order, whatever it is.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to answer the question asked by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is very strange that we can not have a petition presented without two or three political speeches upon it.

Mr. HALE. What does the Senator call a political speech?

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course that is a question of taste between the Senator from Maine and myself, perhaps. He will select what he considers a political speech, and I will determine what I regard as a political speech.

Mr. HALE. It has come to a great pass if a man can not make comments upon a thing of this kind without being charged with making a political speech.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does not seem necessary, I will say to the Senator from Maine, that upon the presentation of a petition and upon every possible subject that is brought before the Senate a pro-Boer or some speech of a similar nature shall be made. I do not think the Senate or the country needs enlightenment to that extent.

Mr. HALE. My remarks were called out by those of the Senator from California who proposed that this Government should intervene for the relief of the sufferers in India. I asked a clear and direct question. I want the Senator from California to answer it.

Mr. PERKINS. There is much force in the question of the Senator from Maine and the argument which he presents. Therefore, realizing the force of his question, instead of asking the Senate to take action upon this measure at this time, I ask that the

petition be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, of which he is a member, for their consideration, that the committee may take such action as it may deem expedient and advisable.

In answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, I desire to say that this petition coming here—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island has objected to further debate. Debate is not in order.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have a right to do so under the rule.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., May 31, 1900.

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS, United States Senator.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, realizing the urgent necessity of prompt action on the part of this and other Christian nations in order to avoid the destruction by famine of a large proportion of the inhabitants of India, earnestly request you to introduce in the Senate and House the following bill or such other measure of similar purport as may commend itself to your best judgment:

An act making appropriations to supply the needs of the famine sufferers in India.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of — millions of dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply the needs of the famine sufferers in India, the same to be expended at the discretion of the President, and to remain available until January 1, 1901.

W. H. BEATTY,

Chief Justice Supreme Court of California.

CHARLES NELSON,

The Chamber of Commerce.

EDWARD B. CLAPP,

University of California.

A. A. DENISON,

Chairman of Committee on Organization Oakland Peace Society.

J. G. WRIGHT.

J. G. McGUIRE.

G. W. McNAIR.

H. HUNTINGTON.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, presented a petition of Eureka Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lyons, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation placing a tax upon oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Building Trades Council of New York, remonstrating against the inferior class of workmen employed by the Government at Ellis Island, New York Harbor; the inferior rate of wages paid them; and also against the employment of noncitizens of the United States by the contractors for the work; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of Local Union Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Schenectady; of the Trades Assembly of Schenectady; of the American Federation of Labor of Jamestown; of the Collar, Shirt, and Waist Cutters' Union No. 6305, of Troy, all in the State of New York; of the International Wood Carvers' Association of America, and of the Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' International Union, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and workmen employed upon the public works of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Hancock Relief Corps of Westerly, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of Iron Molders' Union No. 180, of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Trenton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation for the prevention of the denial or abridgment of the right of citizens of the United States to vote on account of color; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of the congregation of the Grant Street Chapel, of Berwick; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waynesburg; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Somerset; the congregations of the Free Methodist Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Baptist Church, the First Presbyterian Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Bradford; the First Presbyterian Church of Mount Carmel; of Colonel John B. Clark Post, No. 152, Grand Army of the Republic, of Allegheny; of the Central Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Linwood, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bellrun, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 626, United Mine Workers, of Desire, Pa., and a petition of Local Union No. 1333, United Mine Workers, of Mahanoy City, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation limiting the hours of daily service of

laborers and workmen employed upon the public works of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PORT OF WILMINGTON, N. C.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a letter, in the nature of a petition, stating some further facts about the port at Wilmington, N. C. I call attention to the fact that the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, Gen. John M. Wilson, states in this letter Wilmington is a better harbor than Charleston. He says that at Charleston low water is 19 feet and high water only 24.3 feet, while at Wilmington low water is 20½ feet and high water 25 feet. It has taken enormous and constant dredging to get that much water at Charleston. Only a few years ago there was only 17 feet of water there.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that General Wilson, in this letter, sustains the statements I made a few days ago, when the question of moving the dry dock from Port Royal to Charleston was before the Senate. Senators will see now that they made a great mistake when they limited the investigation of a site for this dry dock to Charleston. I hope something can be done yet to open up this matter.

Inasmuch as that question is not now before the Senate, I ask that this letter be put in the RECORD without reading. Senators can read it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1900.

SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your request of the 15th instant, and in reply to furnish the information then desired, as follows:

Port Royal, S. C.—Depth of entrance channel at mean low water, about 19 feet; depth of entrance channel at mean high water, about 25.3 feet. From the entrance to the docks at Port Royal the least channel depth is about 21 feet at mean low water, and about 28 feet at mean high water.

Charleston, S. C.—Depth of entrance channel at mean low water, 19 feet 3 inches; depth of entrance channel at mean high water, 24.3 feet. After passing within the entrance there is a comparatively narrow channel for about 2½ miles, with a least depth of 21 feet at mean low water and 26 feet at mean high water; thence to the city docks, on the eastern water front of Charleston, the channel depth at mean low water is at least 30 feet, and at mean high water, 35 feet.

Congress has entered upon a further project for securing a depth of 26 feet at low water from the ocean to deep water inside Charleston Harbor.

Wilmington, N. C.—From the ocean to good anchorage at Southport, 24 miles below Wilmington, the least low-water depth is 20½ feet, and the least high-water depth is 25 feet. Between Southport and Wilmington the least low-water depth is 18 feet, and the least high-water depth 20½ feet.

The least depth of 18 feet exists on two shoals only, and it is expected that the channel through these shoals will be deepened to 20 feet before the end of the present fiscal year. The least low-water depth will then be 20 feet, and the least high-water depth, 22½ feet.

Savannah, Ga.—The latest information available shows a least depth of 17½ feet at mean low water from Tybee to the wharf at the city of Savannah; mean tides at wharfs, 6½ feet.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN M. WILSON,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Hon. JOHN D. BELLAMY,
United States House of Representatives.

JOINT TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask to have printed the usual number of a document which I hold in my hand, being a hearing before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate in relation to the agreement of the Joint Traffic Association. It is the only copy left, and it is sought after by many persons.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to ask for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution reported from that committee on the 21st ultimo. It went on the Calendar on account of an objection.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask my friend from New York a question. What does the phrase "the remaining volumes" signify?

Mr. PLATT of New York. This is one volume.

Mr. HOAR. Already printed?

Mr. PLATT of New York. One is printed and one will be ready after the adjournment. The concurrent resolution was submitted by the colleague of the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. It would be better to say second and third volume, but I will not interpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution was reported from the Committee on Printing with amendments, which will be stated.

The amendments of the committee were:

On line 4 strike out all after the word "bound" down to and including the word "Representatives," on line 6.

On line 7 strike out the words "that, in addition thereto, there be printed."

On line 12, after the word "and," insert "500 copies of the second and subsequent volumes, to be bound in brown cloth, uniform with the first volume, for distribution by the Department of State."

On line 16, after the word "morocco," add "Provided, That the printing and binding of the report of the Philippine Commission under the concurrent resolution of February 23, 1900, shall not include this supplement."

So as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That of each of the remaining volumes of the Philippine Commission's report there shall be printed and bound 1,500 copies of each for the use of the Philippine Commission:

That, for the special use of the Department of State, there be printed of the full report 200 copies on 70-pound paper and bound in half morocco; and 500 copies of the second and subsequent volumes, to be bound in brown cloth, uniform with the first volume, for distribution by the Department of State;

That of the supplement to the commission's report there be printed, for the use of the Department of State, 1,500 copies in royal octavo and bound in half morocco: *Provided*, That the printing and binding of the Report of the Philippine Commission under the concurrent resolution of February 23, 1900, shall not include this supplement.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 58 to the bill (H. R. 10459) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

EUGENE HALE,

GEORGE C. PERKINS,

B. R. TILLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,

ALSTON G. DAYTON,

AMOS J. CUMMINGS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HALE. I move the adoption of the report, and that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and disagree to the amendments thereto of the House of Representatives, and ask for a further conference, the conferees to be appointed by the Chair.

I may state here for the benefit of the Senate that in this controversy the first conference had to deal with all the Senate amendments and cut down the items disagreed to to the three propositions, the surveys, the course of study for the cadets, and armor plate. When that conference report was presented to the House the House amended the Senate proposition, which was \$445 per ton or an armor-plant proposition, by substituting for it the following—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. In the House?

Mr. HALE. In the House.

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to procure by contract armor of the best quality for any or all vessels above referred to, provided such contracts can be made at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable; but in case he is unable to make contracts for armor under the above conditions, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to procure a site for and to erect thereon a factory for the manufacture of armor, and the sum of \$4,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward the erection of said factory.

Now, in the conference, the report of which I have just presented, the conferees found themselves at a deadlock. The Senate conferees insisted upon the proposition of the Senate, \$445 a ton or an armor-plate manufactory, which was made mandatory, directing the Secretary of the Navy, if he could not get the contract at \$445, to go on at once, and giving him, to start it, \$2,000,000 for the Government armor plant. The House antagonized that with a proposition which left it all discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy, leaving the contract discretionary with him, and even if he should fail, leaving the building of the armor plant discretionary with him.

The Senate conferees felt that the proposition was so distinctively opposed in every respect to what the Senate, after full discussion and debate, had adopted that we could not agree to their proposition. We found the House conferees equally firm. They would not agree to the proposition of \$445 a ton or an armor plant. The other subjects-matter were not agreed to; we could not come to a point of agreement upon them, but they did not consume the time of the committee as the other did. I want Senators to understand that the whole subject is hung up now in this way, that the House wants the whole matter left discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. HALE. I shall be very glad to answer any question.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator read the last clause of the amendment or instruction of the House to its conferees with regard to the Secretary of the Navy establishing an armor plant?

Mr. HALE. The House did not give instructions upon this item. The House amended it. But upon another item—the surveys—the House went further than it usually does, to a point that, I think, has not been done in the Senate, and not only rejected the Senate proposition, but directed its conferees to insist. We do not do that in the Senate, because it is plain that that prevents having a fair conference. The instructions did not apply to this amendment.

Mr. TELLER. To what amendment did they apply it?

Mr. HALE. To surveys.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The point I was trying to get at is whether under the House plan the building of an armor plant is left discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy. I wanted to hear the language.

Mr. HALE. I will read that clause again.

But in case he—

The Secretary—

is unable to make contracts for armor under the above conditions, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to procure a site for and to erect thereon a factory for the manufacture of armor, and the sum of \$4,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward the erection of said factory.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the status of that clause? Did the House attempt to put it in the bill?

Mr. HALE. The Senate put in its clause at \$445 or an armor plant. The House amended it on the floor by striking out the \$445 proposition or an armor plant and substituting for it what I have just read.

Mr. CHANDLER. They accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment of their own?

Mr. HALE. With an amendment of their own; and therefore I have moved that the Senate not only insist on its amendments, but disagree to the amendments of the House thereto, in order that a new conference may be had.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Would it make any difference in the minds of the Senate conferees if that amendment of the House were changed so as to make it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Navy to establish the armor plant if he could not get the contracts upon terms which he thought just and equitable?

Mr. HALE. I can not say; nobody can say. The matter is hung up, and is to be submitted to a future conference. I can not say how, in a future conference, that might strike the Senate conferees. It would, in my judgment, be a better amendment with that provision in than it is now.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to say in connection with the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut that I trust the conferees will not agree to such an amendment of the House provision, because I should feel myself constrained to antagonize it just as vigorously as in its present shape, for it would be in effect the same thing.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is no difference.

Mr. BUTLER. The difficulty in the House proposition is in the first part of their amendment and not in the last part. It is in that part which leaves the discretion open and unrestricted to the Secretary of the Navy. It makes no difference who is Secretary of the Navy, that is improper legislation, in my judgment. It is a bad precedent. Then, we should not abdicate our functions and turn them over to any official, if he was perfection itself.

Mr. HALE. Let me tell the Senator that the Senate conferees took that ground.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the Senator from Maine to say that that would be an improvement.

Mr. HALE. I think it would.

Mr. BUTLER. Why so?

Mr. HALE. Because I think that then there would be the same feature in it that there is in our bill, the manufacturers knowing that if they did not submit a reasonable proposition the armor plant would be built. As it stands now, there is no obligation to build the armor plant at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is a reasonable proposition, if I may ask?

Mr. HALE. I will not argue the subject.

Mr. BUTLER. When Congress will not say itself what is a reasonable price, when Congress itself abdicates its functions, the Secretary of the Navy will do what we all know he will do. He will simply say, "I will pay what they ask." That is what every Government official has done when Congress abdicated and did not have the courage to say itself what ought to be paid. They take the view that Congress has simply surrendered and tells them to get the armor, and they will proceed to get it and will pay whatever is asked.

Mr. President, it is childish. I hope Congress will not be put in that position; and I for one will not agree that it ever shall be put in that position.

Now, one word further, if the Senator will pardon me, while I am on the floor.

Mr. HALE. I do not object to this discussion; in fact, I rather invite it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me to finish my statement, I will then yield to him.

Mr. President, one word further. I trust that this conference between the two Houses will not be drawn out indefinitely and have this conference report brought in just on the eve of final adjournment.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator a question. He says he trusts this conference will not be drawn out. Now, what force is there anywhere that will prevent this being drawn out if one side or the other does not yield? Here the Senate conferees in

this matter have stood squarely on the Senate proposition and have declined any arrangement, and the House conferees did the same. Supposing this conference—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from South Carolina let me finish my statement?

Mr. HALE. How can you prevent the conference being drawn out?

Mr. BUTLER. I will explain just what I meant, and I was going to proceed to do it. In my opinion, if the House conferees understood that we were in earnest, that we had already gone too far, and that we were not going any further, this thing would soon be settled, because the proposition in the Senate amendment is outrageously high, and nothing but excessive greed would keep the companies from being satisfied with it. The profit is bigger than any legitimate business could ask under any conditions.

Mr. President, there is no one in this Senate more anxious than I am, for reasons I shall not state, for an early adjournment of Congress; but unless the day is fixed to adjourn, we can not adjourn soon with this House amendment brought to us in this bill.

Mr. HALE. I want to ask the Senator another question. He says if the House conferees thought the Senate was in earnest, the matter would soon be settled. We debated this proposition longer than any proposition that I have ever known, in my experience, debated on the naval appropriation bill; and the Senate adopted, not by a large majority, but adopted it as against the other proposition, which was lower.

Mr. TILLMAN. Therefore, if the Senator will permit me, the situation is this: A majority of the body are in favor of the Senate amendment, and the rest of the Senate are in favor of \$300 and an armor plant. Therefore, you might say that the entire Senate is either for this amendment or something better or lower down, and that the House can not expect such a condition as that to be overridden by a majority of 10 on that side, for that is all they had on the last vote. So if we will adhere now with instructions to the Senate conferees as to what we intend to do, the House will have to recede. That is all there is about it, and there are enough men over there who will yield.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Maine allow me?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not propose to discuss this question, as it has been heretofore before the Senate—that is, on the merits of it—but I realize the fact that when the Senate and the House come to a deadlock on a proposition, neither party can have their way entirely; that is to say, if any legislation is to be accomplished, there must be a compromise. I do not speak for anybody but myself.

I have had no consultation with anyone, but for myself I would be content to agree to the present proposition of the House, so amended that in case the Secretary of the Navy could not obtain the armor at prices which to him seemed just and reasonable, he should be compelled to start an armor plant. I want to say with regard to that matter, that I believe the Senate and the country can trust the Secretary of the Navy. He, of course, is conversant with all of these debates; he has seen that the utmost limit to which the Senate is willing to go is \$445 a ton for armor, and that that was only by a narrow majority, while a minority almost equal to the votes of the majority thought the price should be \$300 a ton and that an armor plant should be built anyway. I am satisfied that neither the present Secretary of the Navy nor any other Secretary of the Navy would, under these circumstances, ever consent to purchase armor plate at more than \$445 a ton, and that he would get it at a less price if he could.

I do not quite like the statement made, that if this provision is passed, the Secretary of the Navy will give just what the manufacturers of armor plate may ask. I feel very sure—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let me finish the sentence.

I feel very sure and very confident that the Secretary of the Navy would never pay more than the amount which has been put into the Senate bill by amendment.

It seems to me that this is a way out of the dilemma and that under it the Government will never be compelled to pay any more than the amount which the Senate by a majority put into the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Connecticut has no higher regard for the personal integrity of the Secretary of the Navy than I have; but the very fact that the other House is stubbornly refusing to agree to limit the price of armor to \$445 a ton disproves the Senator's statement, because the very forces and influences that make them stand out for not agreeing to that limit will mean that we will not get armor plate at \$445 a ton unless we limit it to that amount.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator from North Carolina were Secretary of the Navy, or if I were, or if any other member of this Senate were, and the bill were left in the shape in which it is proposed to be left by the House, amended as I have suggested, neither he nor I nor any other member of the Senate would

ever think of contracting at a higher rate than \$445 a ton. I may be mistaken, Mr. President, in my confidence—

Mr. BUTLER. If the House thought that way with the Senator, then the House would agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me to say a word?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will; but I want to say a few more words myself.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is upon this precise point.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Very well.

Mr. CHANDLER. I only want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact—not to make an argument—that the combined armor-plate factories insisted upon \$545 a ton for the armor for the *Kearsarge* and the *Kentucky*, and compelled the Secretary of the Navy to give it. So in every case, where the Secretary has made a contract without being limited by Congress, he has given exactly the price which the combined manufacturers have demanded, and there was no competition.

Mr. BUTLER. Exactly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I want to say this, and that is all: I do not put my confidence solely upon my understanding of the character of the present Secretary of the Navy; but if the Administration should be entirely reversed next November, and any other man should be appointed to the position of Secretary of the Navy, I can not for a moment believe, and I do not for a moment believe, that any Secretary of the Navy would contract for armor plate at a sum exceeding \$445 a ton.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the vice of the House amendment is this: In the first place, we give to the Secretary of the Navy entire discretion as to what he shall pay for armor plate. Then we say to him, "If you think you have paid too much for it, you may build an armor plant."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I beg the Senator's pardon. We say to him, "If you can not get it at a sum which you think just and reasonable, then you can build an armor plant."

Mr. TELLER. We leave it to him to say what is just and reasonable. Just and reasonable why and how? Under an arbitrary direction we have given him to buy this armor plate. That is what we have told him to do; and he has got to do that, and that is the condition under which he buys it.

The suggestion by the Senator from Connecticut, that is, if you could amend the last clause and provide that it should be in his discretion, would absolutely amount to nothing at all. Instead of being in his discretion, it should be made imperative on him, provided he can not get the plate at what he thinks he ought to get it for; but, under the circumstances, when he has bought it, he will think he ought to have paid that for it; and that is all there is of it.

As suggested by the Senator from North Carolina, if the House committee believed that we would get this armor plate at a fair price and that this company would take a fair price for it, they would not be so tenacious about their amendment.

I want to make a prediction, Mr. President. We declared by this Senate unanimously that these armor-plate companies were robbing the Government, and every Senator who got up here and made a speech on it so declared. Every vote that was given was with the intent to prevent them from robbing the Government further. Nearly one-half of the Senate was in favor of limiting the price to a figure very much below what a slight majority favored, but the sentiment of the Senate, taking both sides, those who favored \$300 a ton for armor plate and those who were willing to go up to \$540, or whatever it might be, all said this: I predict that we shall back out, that we shall give to these armor-plate factories just exactly what they demand, nor will we provide for an armor plant.

This bill came here from the House of Representatives with certain provisions in it that were objectionable, but not so objectionable as the feature which is now thrust upon us. They were nothing like so objectionable as this proposition which comes to us from the House, which is an absolute surrender to this combine.

I want the Senator who has this bill in charge to take the vote of the Senate on the conference report; and if he does not, I am going to call for a vote. I want to know whether the Senate is going to back out or not.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that is precisely what I want to know. I make a report in which the Senate conferees stand squarely against any amendment of the Senate proposition. I want the Senate by a vote to back up and accept the report. That is all we can do.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I want the Senate to do.

Mr. HALE. And I have no doubt the Senate will do that.

Mr. TELLER. I want them to do that so as to strengthen the hands of the committee. I do not want this conference report to go in the way suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. I would rather it came here as it came originally from the House of Representatives when it was not as objectionable in its features as it is now. So I hope the proposition will be put to a yea-and-nay

vote, and let us decide whether we are willing to surrender to this combine or whether we are willing to fight it.

So far as I am concerned, before I would surrender to them I would not put a single pound of armor plate on a ship. I do not know but that we may be involved in a war with some nation, though I do not think there is any danger of it. At all events, I would not be a party to having any combine in this country take the Government of the United States by the throat in a matter of this kind. I would infinitely prefer that the ships would rot on their stocks than that we should do that; and so would the American people. The time has been reached, Mr. President, when at least these combines should not be able to take the Government by the throat, even if they take the people by the throat.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, before saying a few words on this question, I should like to ascertain, if the Senator from Maine will give me his attention, whether there is any way in which the Senate can get the bill back into this body and reduce the number of ships? We authorized 2 battle ships, 3 armored cruisers, and 3 protected cruisers. There are 8 ships, which will cost forty or fifty million dollars. Is there any parliamentary way in which the Senate can get control of the bill and limit the number of ships to be built? Could we reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed?

Mr. HALE. No; I do not know how that can be done. That is a subject which has been passed and which has been agreed to by both Houses.

Mr. CHANDLER. But it seems to me there ought to be some way, if, in the progress of conferences between the two Houses, either House wishes to take back some portion of what it has done, that it may do that thing.

Mr. FORAKER. I see the Senator from New Hampshire is bold enough to make an inquiry, which encourages me to make one that I had in mind. I do not wish to see this bill back in the Senate in order that we may reduce the number of ships, but I should like to see it back here, if there is any parliamentary way by which it can be brought back, so that we may reduce the price of armor plate from \$445 a ton to \$400 a ton. I voted against fixing the price at \$400 a ton because I wanted to follow the judgment of the committee and support the committee, but I did so against my own judgment.

I shall be glad, in view of what has occurred, if we can have a chance to undo the proposition to pay \$445 a ton, if that will be accepted, and to put it at \$400 a ton, which, according to the judgment of everybody, it seems to me is enough for us to pay; and if we can not get the armor plate for that sum, then build an armor-plate factory.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to answer the question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. That is a subject that is unlike the building of the ships, which has been agreed to by both Houses; it is still in the discretion of the Senate, but not upon this conference report unless it is voted down. But if at any time any proposition of agreement between the conferees is presented, either fixing the rate at which the contracts shall be made or leaving it in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, then that proposition can be amended by the Senate, just as the House has amended our proposition by putting in this clause.

So I can say to the Senator from Ohio that all the discretion that is needed and all that is required is left in this subject-matter to the Senate finally.

Mr. FORAKER. I want to say now that at the proper time, if it become necessary, that proposition will be made; and I can say also, if it is worth anything to the conferees on behalf of the Senate, that quite a number of Senators who voted for \$445 a ton will change their votes and vote for \$400 a ton as the maximum, and, in the event of that not being accepted, then to peremptorily command the building of an armor-plate factory by the Government.

Mr. HALE. I am glad the Senator from Ohio has stated his proposition. My object in this matter was to elicit discussion, in order to get at the views of Senators, because the conferees want to represent the body so far as they can; and the discussion throws light upon the present feeling of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the chairman of the committee allow me to ask him a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the Senator, or rather I will ask the Chair, would it not be in order now, in view of the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], for himself and others, that a clear majority of the Senate right now is in favor of reducing the price of armor to \$400 a ton—and there was only 2 majority before in fixing the price at \$445 instead of \$400 a

ton—would it not be in order now to amend the Senate amendment and reduce the amount from \$445 to \$400, and let the conferees go back with that instruction from the Senate?

Mr. HALE. I do not think that is in order now, because the committee reports a complete disagreement. It is not proposed to change or amend at all, but that we disagree on the whole subject-matter.

Mr. BUTLER. I want our conferees to go back with instructions for \$400 a ton instead of \$445. Therefore, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed this bill and put in the item of \$445, and that it be reduced to \$400.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can not do that.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it in order to move a reconsideration of the action of the Senate?

Mr. HALE. It was passed ten days ago, and has been in conference since that time.

Mr. BUTLER. Then what is the parliamentary status? In what way can it be reached? Can the conferees themselves reach it?

Mr. HALE. I have just said to the Senator from Ohio that this is a report of an absolute disagreement. We do not agree at all to the House amendment, and they do not agree to our proposition. It is a square, plump clash, a deadlock between the two Houses on this proposition, and, unless the Senate votes down and refuses to accept the conference report, nothing further can be done except to go into another conference.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, let me ask the Senator, suppose the Senate votes down the conference report, then would my motion be in order?

Mr. HALE. It would not be in order for the Senator to move to reconsider the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, when we vote down the conference report, how do we improve the parliamentary status, then?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I think I will resume now, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. But the Senator has not informed me how we can reach this matter.

Mr. HALE. The Senate can not reach it now, but if a proposition should come in at any future time for adjusting this upon any basis, then the subject-matter will be entirely in the control of the Senate so far as it is concerned. It can change the \$445 to \$400 or \$425, or put it up to \$455, or can make it discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. When can the Senate do that?

Mr. HALE. When any proposition of that kind comes in.

Mr. BUTLER. Comes in from where?

Mr. HALE. From the conference committee.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not the conference report here now?

Mr. HALE. The conference report is that we disagree absolutely. That includes everything.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is nothing for the Senate to do except to agree or to disagree.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, what kind of a conference report would have to be made?

Mr. HALE. When the conference committee agree upon something and present it, that is an agreement. Then the whole thing will be in the hands of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. If my colleague will permit me, does the Senator hold that when a conference report comes here upon agreement the Senate can amend it on motion?

Mr. HALE. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is palpable that that can not be done. The only vote we can take is on agreeing or disagreeing to the report.

Mr. HALE. Of course, that is a preliminary. For instance, if the conferees brought in a proposition of discretion and the Senate was against it, they could vote down the report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then the matter would go back to conference.

Mr. HALE. Yes; it would go back to conference.

Mr. LODGE. Could not the Senate amend or disagree, with instructions to its conferees?

Mr. HALE. That is the same thing. It is in the power of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to say one word.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to say a word on the parliamentary question. Practically the only way, when there is really a serious disagreement between the two Houses, is to disagree and send the matter back to a new conference. It is in order undoubtedly to instruct your conferees in the new conference—

Mr. GALLINGER. But that does not amend the bill.

Mr. HOAR. That, of course, does not amend the bill. Such an instruction is almost never desirable, because it is to that extent a limitation of the freedom of the conferees. It is very

apt to make the other House, with whom you are conferring, persist in their position also and give instructions on their side if they really differ. Of course you can instruct the conferees to yield to the other side; that is a different thing; but practically we have always found that our way of working out these disagreements and getting, so far as we could, what we want is to let the conferees go back uninstructed and to let them get at the true sense of their body by debate and expressions of Senators, just as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] a few moments ago said to the Senate that in his judgment the Senate would come to a certain opinion in the future different from that which has been exhibited by its past vote. That is a very significant and important and valuable statement, which will be read and understood by the House conferees, and it will have much more effect in bringing about a concurrence than it would if we should vote to adhere or vote to instruct, which is almost as bad.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, this discussion has grown out of the inquiry I made as to whether there was any way by which the Senate could get possession of this bill and reconsider its passage. I believe there is such a way. It may be that a motion to reconsider would be late; but we passed the bill with certain Senate amendments. Why can not we reconsider? The bill is here in the Senate, in the possession of the Senate, and we can reconsider, in my judgment. There ought to be a way in which the Senate can say, "We are sorry we passed that bill. We want to reconsider it, and try it again."

Now, Mr. President, the reason I wanted to be informed on that point is this: The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] very well knows that this bill never would have passed the Senate with provision for two great battle ships, three armored cruisers, and three protected cruisers, costing forty or fifty million dollars, if it had been supposed that by any possibility a provision would be inserted in the bill giving the Secretary of the Navy unlimited power to buy and fix the price of armor. It is now proposed by this House amendment that he may pay \$550 a ton for armor plate; he may pay \$600 or \$700. He is absolutely at the mercy of the armor-plate combine, unless he decides not to build the ships, but to go on and build an armor-plate factory, which, according to the prediction of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], will not give us an armor plate in four years.

Mr. President, what I wanted to get at was this: Whether there is any possibility that the Senate can recede from its decision to adopt this great naval programme for armored vessels, because I am alarmed at the proposition which the House of Representatives made, that at the end of four or five years' investigation and discussion we are to end it all, quit the controversy with the armor-plate people, and the differences of opinion between the two Houses, and say to the Secretary of the Navy, "We end it all here now; pay just what you choose; and when you have decided what you will choose to pay, if you can not get the armor for that sum, then do not build these ships; take the responsibility as one man of stopping this whole naval programme of national armament, and go to work and build an armor factory." It would be the most foolish and the most preposterous thing that could be conceived of for us to do that thing.

The foundation principle of the course of the Committee on Appropriations is to make specific appropriations; to know what they are doing when they authorize the expenditure of the Government's money. Undoubtedly, if anything can be bought in open market by advertisement and competition, you can wisely give the head of a Department unlimited authority to procure the article, to get the service, to get the work done; but Congress has been confronted these half dozen years by a condition of things showing that there was no competition whatever, and we have been obliged at every step in the business to pay exactly what the combined armor manufacturers of the United States and of Europe demand.

I say, Mr. President, that if there is any danger of committing this discretion to the Secretary of the Navy, there ought to be some way to get the bill back into the Senate and reduce the number of ships, if not to decide that there shall be no additional ships authorized by this bill, but that the Secretary of the Navy shall go on and at any price the combine will give him put the armor upon the ships already built and which need the armor, and then stop until Congress can find out what is the price of armor, as it has been trying to find out all these years.

Mr. TILLMAN. I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire, if he will permit me, to the fact that the ships provided in this bill, which he is now seeking to get back in order to cut them out, are nothing like so much as are those already authorized in previous bills and held up. We have 5 other battle ships authorized and 3 armored cruisers and 3 battle ships now on the stocks to provide armor for, besides the 8 in this bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that very well; and the Government will submit to this extortion as to the ships we have already authorized if the House of Representatives, the members of which—

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. In one moment. It will submit to it if the House, the members of which are to go before their constituents for reelection or defeat in November, insist upon it. We might submit to the extortion as to the ships already authorized, but we do not want to authorize eight more ships.

Mr. SCOTT. I wanted to ask the Senator from New Hampshire how he knows that this is an extortion. I want to know whether or not he is an expert on the cost of manufacturing armor plate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, thoroughly expert. I have studied this subject for six years, and the Senator from West Virginia has not studied it for five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Twenty-eight years. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I grew up in a manufacturing city; that I am interested in a number of steel plants and different manufacturing concerns, and I think I know more in a day about manufacturing than he ever knew in his life.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from West Virginia manufactures glass. That is his business, and I do not know but that we had better armor the ships with glass—

Mr. SCOTT. That would be good.

Mr. CHANDLER. If we can get it from his establishment in West Virginia. It would be a most unwise and injudicious and unseemingly thing for us in Congress to put this responsibility upon the Secretary of the Navy. All the naval officers about him want him to pay the largest sum. I have had occasion to say hitherto that the naval officers are not economical. They have no idea of how money is raised by taxation, and they will always advise him to pay the largest sum.

The Secretary of the Navy is an ambitious man. He may in time reach higher honors than those to which he has already attained, and by the aid of New England I hope he may go on to higher honors than those of the Secretary of the Navy. Do we want to single him out and say to him, "Stop the building of these ships unless you can get armor for what you think is a fair price," when the Congress of the United States is too cowardly to fix the price?

We ought not to do anything of the kind. The Secretary of the Navy will not take the responsibility of arresting the construction of these ships. He will submit. He will not take the responsibility of waiting one, two, three, or four years, whatever the time may be, until the armor can be manufactured at a Government factory. He will build the ships, and this contest against the combined monopoly of these great establishments will come to an end. If it does so come to an end, I shall certainly wash my hands of the subject and hereafter take lessons from the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the matter would be simplified if we discussed simply what we can do. The object of a conference of course is to bring the two Houses together. A bill that has once gone into conference is no longer in the possession of either House. It is in the possession of both Houses. On the proposition of the authorization of ships, the minds of the Houses have met, and it has passed beyond the control of either House. One House can not touch a proposition that the two Houses have agreed on. We can deal only with the proposition in regard to armor plate. That is open. There has been an absolute disagreement on that. On that we can either recede and accept the House proposition, or we can insist on our disagreement and have a further conference, or we can vote to adhere and lose the bill if the other House also votes to adhere; but we can not bring into it a proposition to amend other parts of the bill on which the House have already agreed. Nothing is open but the matters in disagreement between the Houses.

Now, this armor-plate business to me is simply a question as to how we shall get the ships. That is the main thing—get the ships. I am ready to stand for the building of an armor plant absolutely, if the authority is given while it is going on to buy armor at a proper price and build the ships. I believe the figures suggested by the Senator from Ohio would absolutely stop the building of ships. I think at \$445 we could go on, but if we simply provide for the building of an armor plant and give no authority to buy armor, it means to stop the construction of the Navy. I hope, Mr. President, that we shall take the natural course. The conferees who represent the views of the Senate have made this disagreement. They are prepared to go in and still further press our views, and they know what the views of the Senate are. As I say, I hope we will take the natural course and insist on our disagreement, and send the conferees back to try to reach an agreement with the other House.

Mr. President, I rose also to ask the Senator from Maine a question in regard to another point in disagreement. I want to know what has been done in regard to surveys, and I shall be very much obliged if the Senator will tell me just where we are on that proposition.

Mr. HALE. I am glad the Senator has asked me that question, because that ought to be before the Senate. Perhaps the great importance of the armor question has submerged this subject.

The Navy Department, under its most excellently managed Hydrographic Office, is doing surveys in the ocean and to a limited extent on the lakes, although mostly done there by the War Department, and about the Philippines and about Cuba, because it has ships, it has trained officers, it can make charts and maps, and can do the work well. The Senate gave it a hundred thousand dollars, with authority to go on and continue the surveys which the Department is now making. The House originally cut it down to \$10,000.

In its action upon the last conference report the House cut down the jurisdiction of this survey by limiting the kind of work it should do—by limiting it geographically—and gave it only \$20,000. The Senate conferees could not agree to that. The House conferees would submit no proposition of amendment, but the vote in the House was square and direct upon it. Therefore on this matter the conferees are again at deadlock, and it is for the reason applying to this and applying to the armor-plate matter and the other subjects of dispute that the conference committee has reported—I made the report this morning—an actual disagreement. The Senate conferees do not believe in yielding on this matter; and that is included in the report. On all the subjects-matter, I will say to the Senator, as I have said about armor plate, we may controvert and we may discuss—and it is a good thing to do, and I have invited this discussion because I want to get at the minds of Senators—but in the end one side or the other has to yield something or the bill will fail. I am not prepared to yield. I think the Senate proposition is just and fair, both on surveys and on armor plate. We find the House in like condition.

Now, what will come out of it on the matter of surveys I can not tell the Senator. I only know that at present the Senate is not inclined to yield, and I am not at all inclined to yield. I do not want to see that service crippled.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his statement in regard to the surveys. I think nothing more mischievous could possibly be done than that which is proposed by the House amendment. As I understand, it did not come from their Naval Committee. It is part of the bad practice which was discussed here the other day in regard to surveys. It is an attempt to take from the Navy its hydrographic surveys and throw them into the Coast Survey, building up another great department with, as the Senator from New Hampshire said, another little navy. I have had a great many letters from large shipping firms, expressing great dissatisfaction with the Coast Survey maps, and urging in the strongest terms the importance of the hydrographic surveys. There is no economy in increasing the appropriation to the Coast Survey and building that up and trying to break down the naval service. The Navy is going on. We have the officers there under our pay. You make no reduction. You simply pour more money into one of these multifold surveys which the Government is carrying forward.

It would be a great injury to navigation, in my judgment, to break down the Hydrographic Office; and I am delighted to hear that the conferees on the part of the Senate propose to stand with absolute firmness on that point, for I believe that is the judgment of the Senate, and I believe it is sound judgment in the way of administration and in the way of getting the best results.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate but a moment. In this discussion a number of Senators have taken occasion to say that the price charged for armor plate is exorbitant, that it is robbery, etc. I do not believe that a manufacturer of armor plate to-day could himself tell what it is going to cost him. They may press one, and it may break down. They may get one good plate, and then they get twenty bad ones that have to be remelted. I am only saying that the manufacturers themselves are unable to determine definitely the cost of the plate. The crane that lifts the immense plates may break. When gentlemen assert here that it is robbery and extortion, practically, I say that such language should not be used against those manufacturers, because I am satisfied that the cost of armor plate is greater than a great many of the Senators have any idea.

The gentlemen who make armor plates and prepare them for the Navy have but one customer. When they make tool steel, for which, as I said the other day, we pay \$851 a ton—and you are talking about robbery in paying \$445 for armor plate—they can sell the tool steel to hundreds and thousands of consumers all over the country. I desired simply to offer these few suggestions in defense of these much-abused, as I believe, manufacturers of armor plate. They are not so black as they are painted.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has evidently paid no attention whatever to the investigation before the Committee on Naval Affairs. He has not read either the fraud report by the Naval Committee of the House, in which investigation employees of the Carnegie Company testified that they had put on the Government fraudulent armor, armor with blowholes in it, armor that had not been tempered, and a great many other things which were dishonorable and dishonest.

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator that I have read that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then how can the Senator get up here and

undertake to say that other Senators are not justified in saying that these people are unscrupulous and that they have robbed the Government? He has a right to his opinion, but so have we; and those of us who have investigated this matter, and have been doing it for five years on the Naval Committee, and have had the matter satisfactorily proven to our minds are at least entitled to our opinion. If we see proper to get up here and use those strong words, I do not think we ought to be called to account for it. But of course the Senator from West Virginia is exercising his right to express his opinion, and we will do the same thing.

Mr. HANNA rose.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HANNA. I thought the Senator from South Carolina was through.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will yield.

Mr. HANNA. I do not want the Senator to yield. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. As has been pointed out this morning, the Senate is practically unanimous on the proposition of \$445 or less. A majority of 2 voted for \$445 or an armor-plate factory. All the remainder of the Senate voted for \$300 and an armor-plate factory. This bill can fail if the House is obdurate. If it is so set in its affection for this trust, so subservient to it that there can be no loosening of the grasp that it has on that end of the Capitol, we can let the naval appropriation bill fail, or we can strike out all these provisions—the Senate amendment and everything else—and agree to the bill just as it came from the House. I for one would rather see the bill fail than to have us go before the country this year acknowledging that the United States, a great and powerful nation as it is, stands and submits to robbery and extortion.

The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee said, "They put the knife in us when they got us in their power." There is no man on this floor, except the Senator from West Virginia, who pretends to defend this combine. That is the situation; and, as I said, I would rather see the bill fail entirely and have no ships built at all, and let the blame fall on the House of Representatives, who stand there bolstering up and voting for a continuation of this monopoly and its unholy and unrighteous robbery of the people.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. President, I have had the honor to be a member of the Naval Affairs Committee since I have been in this body, besides having had some little experience with manufacturing industries before I came here; and although I have not had the five years of investigation and experience that some of my colleagues have, I pretend to know something about the manufacturing business and something about the manufacture of armor plate, from investigation and absolute personal knowledge. I have refrained from taking any part in this discussion, because I believed it to be the prerogative of a Senator to hear the arguments frankly expressed and then to judge for himself upon the merits of the proposition.

This contest on armor plate began several years ago, and, as has been stated by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from New Hampshire, the construction of ships provided by Congress has been delayed, owing to the failure on the part of the House or the Senate, or both, to reach an agreement on the price of armor plate. I say, as a result of my observation, that the responsibility for the failure of the construction of those ships rests upon the individual efforts of those two Senators in placing the price of armor plate below what any concern in the United States or Europe, or the United States Government itself, could manufacture if for. That is the whole trouble with this matter, and the Senator from South Carolina has given to you the animus of the whole situation when he says that he would rather see the bill fail—and consequently a failure of the progress of our Navy and the development of our marine power—than to be defeated upon a proposition which is untenable—entirely so—from a manufacturing standpoint.

I am not here to defend or uphold any manufacturer or any corporation, but I say upon my own responsibility that \$445 a ton is a reasonable price, yea, a low price, for this material under present conditions. It is a price below what any nation on earth is paying to-day, a price which nobody here yet has stated upon knowledge of facts and figures is a high price.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me? I have a very distinct recollection that in the House of Representatives not only was it proved by investigation that armor plate could be made for \$240 a ton, but the Illinois Steel Company offered to make it for \$260 a ton.

Mr. HANNA. I believe that testimony was produced in some investigation. I happened to know something about that investigation, and I know that that proposition was a pure bluff. The then president of the Illinois Steel Company made the offer in personal pique against other manufacturers of armor plate, just as he has since been guilty of other transactions of the same nature. It was a pure bluff.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Ohio. I should like to ask him whether that bid was not based upon the guaranty on the part of the Government that orders for some 6,000 tons annually should be furnished to the establishment?

Mr. HANNA. Yes; but he had no idea of getting the contract, and did not want it.

Mr. PENROSE. It was a bluff, as the Senator has stated. In addition to that, the stipulation was inserted in the bid that the Government should guarantee, for a series of years, orders of 6,000 tons annually.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has the Senator ever read the report by and testimony taken before the Naval Committee, in which Mr. Linderman and Mr. Schwab testified that if we would give them a contract for 6,000 tons they would give us a rebate of \$100 a ton on it?

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Showing that the magnitude of the contract cuts a big figure in the price.

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator ought to state that there was embraced in the proposition a provision that we should give them a contract for 6,000 tons a year for twenty years.

Mr. TILLMAN. There was no limitation; just 6,000 tons a year.

Mr. HANNA. For a term of years.

Mr. TILLMAN. No term of years.

Mr. HANNA. That was the intention.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not know what their intention was. I am certain it was not good.

Mr. HANNA. I do not want to take up any time in a dialogue on this matter. I simply desire to state the facts as I know them, and I propose to present them fairly.

The cost of making armor, of course, depends largely upon the cost of the raw material and labor. There has been an advance of fully 25 per cent in both since the question was under discussion before, and particularly in labor, which amounts in these works, I am told, to over 30 per cent. Therefore the conditions are not quite so favorable now for regulating the prices as they have been. While I have not fully considered and do not know what is the best basis upon which to compromise this, I do know and I do feel that under those conditions some discretion given to a man of the ability and integrity of our Secretary of the Navy would be greatly to the advantage of the United States in watching his opportunity as he makes contracts, not perhaps in gross tonnage, but from time to time as he sees that it is for the best advantage of the Government to do so.

I want to know whether the character and integrity of that officer are any less to-day than they were when the United States placed at his disposal \$22,000,000 for expenditure during the war. I want to know whether the political ambition of a man of his character can interfere with his judgment and his integrity in the discharge of his public duty. I resent any such imputation upon any member of this Government.

Mr. President, it has been stated here by several Senators, with respect to the ability of the Government to build an armor plant, that it can be done in a year and a half or two years. It can not be built and completed and prepared to furnish armor to the Government in five years.

Mr. SCOTT. That is right.

Mr. HANNA. These immense compressors or presses are only made in two places in the whole world. It would take three years before one of them could be built.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has the Senator read the testimony of Mr. Carnegie before the committee, in which he stated that after having built his addition to his steel works he was able to make armor and deliver it within nine months from the date when he received the contract?

Mr. HANNA. Yes; but the Senator—

Mr. TILLMAN. When the Senator is so reckless in his personal opinions I must call his attention to the facts.

Mr. HANNA. If I ever grow to be as reckless in my assertions as is the Senator from South Carolina, I shall feel very bad about it. Of course, if Mr. Carnegie had his works complete and his machinery prepared and ready for production, he could make armor plate or any other material inside of nine months; but I say, and I repeat it, that no man and no corporation and no amount of money can produce one of these compressors inside of three years, because it can not be made in a shorter time. The immense machinery connected with the whole outfit of armor-plate manufacture is of the same nature.

It so happens that at this time the whole world is busy. The manufacturing industries in this country are driven to their utmost. You can hardly buy an engine of a thousand horsepower short of a year to a year and a half delivery. When you state that this Government can build and complete an armor plant in a year or a year and a half or two years, you are stating what is not true. It is not so.

Mr. TILLMAN. In view of his statement a moment ago, the Senator will recall the fact that several steel mills have been shut down because of want of work.

Mr. HANNA. That is the same man who made the offer of \$245 a ton, who is said to have shut down the mills to influence the stock market.

Mr. TILLMAN. It shows how unscrupulous men get to be when they get to be millionaires through trusts. They not only get to be liars, but thieves, also.

Mr. HANNA. The Senator does not mean to call anybody a liar?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not calling any individual a liar. I am only speaking in general language.

Mr. HANNA. I do not propose to go into that branch of the subject, either.

I have no hesitancy in saying, and I repeat what I said, that an armor plant can not be built and completed in five years; and I have no hesitancy in making a further prophecy, that no matter when it is built or completed, the Government of the United States can not manufacture armor plate within 50 per cent of what it can buy it for. I know how these things are conducted. I know what it means. The bare, naked armor plant is nothing compared with the entirety of such an organization. If you are going into anything economically, you have to commence at the base—the raw material; you have to make your pig iron and your steel, and through all the ramifications of manufacture you have to absorb every profit to the Government in order to economize.

Mr. HOAR. You must have a trained corps of men.

Mr. HANNA. You must have your experts; and then I want to know where you are going to get your knowledge by which you can manufacture the Krupp patent armor. I have heard it stated several times during this discussion that the United States Government could secure that.

Mr. TILLMAN. We only have the testimony of Admiral O'Neil.

Mr. HANNA. I do not care whose testimony the Senator has. I am stating my proposition.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator first appealed—

Mr. HANNA. I am stating my own proposition upon my responsibility.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator first appealed to us not to impeach the honor and integrity of John D. Long, in which I agree with him, and then he turns around and repudiates the admiral in charge of the Ordnance Bureau as unworthy of belief.

Mr. HANNA. I appeal to the Senator, as I am a tyro here, to give me half a chance.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will not interrupt the Senator from Ohio any more.

Mr. HANNA. I thank you.

The cost of armor plate depends on the iron ore, and so through all the ramifications of its manufacture, in every step and process of which labor is involved to the extent of 90 per cent of it. That is the proposition you are obliged to confront to-day. Then there is the advanced price of skilled labor in this country. When you talk about taking anybody and everybody into such a manufacturing establishment, men who know nothing about the processes, you would be running a risk that the United States Government could not afford and would not take. You have got to have skilled mechanics, you have got to have men who have been trained from the beginning of this operation, or else every plate you manufacture will be a failure.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the Government can not get that skilled labor?

Mr. HANNA. They can get it if they hire it from other people who have it.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well. Why not do that?

Mr. HANNA. If you would pay higher, you could get it in that way, probably.

Mr. ALLEN. Why not do that?

Mr. HANNA. I thought you were studying economics.

Mr. ALLEN. I am studying economics. I assume that when the recent Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Herbert, reported that this plate could be made for \$192 a ton, and a great profit made on it, he was sufficiently near the truth, and that between that margin and \$445 a ton the Government might be able to make some money.

Mr. HANNA. I do not believe that plate could ever be made for \$192 a ton.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Herbert made the statement, and it is on file here.

Mr. HANNA. I am not disputing Mr. Herbert; I am stating my opinion; and I think I know as much about the subject as ex-Secretary Herbert.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator own armor plate?

Mr. HANNA. No; but I have been in the manufacturing business, and I have been connected with a steel plant for a great many years.

Mr. ALLEN. Has the Senator ever manufactured armor plate?

Mr. HANNA. No; I have not.

Mr. ALLEN. I mean outside of political armor plate.

Mr. HANNA. No, sir; but I have found it pretty invulnerable. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. With the means employed by the Senator from Ohio in producing invulnerability, I have no doubt he has found it so.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you.

Now, Mr. President, I made the statement at the beginning of my remarks that I did not think \$445 a ton was an excessive price, and I think I know what I am talking about. If either of these concerns that have been manufacturing armor plate in this country had devoted the same amount of capital and attention to any other branch of their manufacturing business, they would have made two dollars where they have made one in the Government work they have done. There is not any branch of the steel industry but what, if they had devoted the same amount of capital and labor in its construction, would have brought a better remuneration. The amount manufactured up to this time has averaged less than 2,000 tons to a plant, and on the cost of that manufacture, with the returns that they have received, they have not made much more than 6 and 10 per cent on their investment; and that is not a manufacturer's profit; it should not be.

Now, with reference to the situation of this bill, I have trusted to able hands and more experienced ones the management of the affairs of the Naval Committee. I have been willing to support the majority of the Senate and leave it for our conferees to attempt at least a settlement of this important question without any personal feeling or prejudice in this matter. But I protest that when it descends to a personal matter and when the Senate has settled this question by a unanimous vote, that question should rest there and go where it belongs for a final settlement, to the conferees. I do protest further that the individual effort by parties who would rather see this bill fail than that they should yield should not be the governing influence in the decision of this important question.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator asks me not to interfere with a tyro, and I would not do it if his remarks were not now in the direction of personal remarks.

Mr. HANNA. I will waive it.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator a few moments ago took occasion to say that it was owing to the efforts or to the work of the Senator from New Hampshire and myself that we were in this condition. While that is one of the highest compliments I have ever had paid me, I leave it to Senators here, who have been convinced by arguments and facts presented in this discussion before the Senator came into this body and since he has been here by which the Senate has voted once, the first time, by a vote of three to one and every time since by a vote of two to one that we were right, to decide as between his assertion that it is a personal matter, a personal triumph, or whether Senators here are independent and act upon their responsibility after they have received proper information.

Mr. HANNA. I have nothing to take back, nor do I intend to drift into any personalities in this discussion. I have not been here as long as either of the other Senators, but during the time I have been in the Senate I have been on the Naval Committee, and as far as my intelligence and perception would carry me I have studied this question, and I think I understand it.

I have risen to say what I have said only because I saw the drift of things and what the intention was, to try to get the bill back from the control of the majority who have decided this question. I stand with the chairman of my committee. I am willing to trust to him and his colleagues on the conference to bring about a fair settlement of this question, a settlement with which the Government ought well to be satisfied. I am in favor of the growth and development of our Navy and of our maritime power in every direction, and therefore I do not want to see any misstatements or misleading facts, ignorantly perhaps, brought to bear upon members in this Chamber to influence them to change their votes if they have voted as their conscience and their judgment dictated in the first instance.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I feel some hesitancy in speaking before a Senate with so many able experts on the subject of building war vessels and manufacturing armor plate. I confess my utter ignorance of the armor-plate question and what it costs and what it ought to cost to make it. I make this confession because I do not want the Senate to find out that I am as ignorant after I have spoken as some of the Senate experts who have spoken on the subject, and studied it five or six years, have shown how ignorant they are and utterly without accurate information, or such as can can enlighten Senators and tell them how to vote.

It is easy to talk about establishing a great armor-plate factory, as if it could be done in a short time without difficulty or embarrassment and with a certainty of success. But let me ask Senators if they know what it would cost? The statement is made

that one can be built for \$4,000,000. Mr. President, it may cost \$10,000,000, and then be a failure.

There is one factor that enters into the building and operating of an armor-plate plant that has not been mentioned and has been overlooked. The armor-plate factories pay, I am told, some of them, a salary of \$40,000, some of \$50,000, per annum to experts, and then a number of them who receive from ten to twenty-five thousand per annum. If the United States Government employed a man as an expert, though he might be better than the Senatorial experts, and paid him \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year for his services, how long would it be before there would be an investigation on account of the waste and extravagance of the people's money? Then, again, owing to the limited number of skilled experts in the world, can the United States calculate with certainty on getting them when and as they may want them? The idea of the Senators who are so learned on this subject is to pay a man about \$2,000 or \$3,000, and the country is full of them at that price, but it is not true that there are many experts whose services can be had at even \$40,000 or \$50,000 per annum. If the armor-plate combine is so wicked and dangerous, it might hire all such talent. In that event, how could the Government go on in building and operating an armor-plate factory?

Again, the United States would be confronted with the use of patents. It would have to go through all the experimental stages that take place in building up an armor-plate factory. It can not be done in a few years. It is not an established industry: at best, it is experimental in the United States and elsewhere. The Senator from Ohio and my colleague have called attention to the fact that the making of armor plate is largely experimental. Some new method, machine, or process may cost a million dollars and then be discarded. If the United States should find itself in this situation, it would be a great loss without any return and be discouraging; while if it is a loss to the manufacturer, it is his risk, and he is supposed to base his calculations upon such contingency.

Now, Mr. President, under private ownership the Government is not responsible for any loss or failure in making experiments.

Mr. President, I oppose building an armor-plate factory by the Government for another reason. It is another step toward paternalism on the part of the Government on a large scale and the Government ownership of public works.

We well remember that the Populist convention the other day in Nebraska put in its platform a plank directly advocating the ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and other plants, as well as the right to print paper money limited according to population. Very soon we will find the Democratic party in its convention at Kansas City on the 4th of July, indorsing this Populist platform and nominating the same man for President that the Populists have nominated. The fact is, the Populist party already dominates the Democratic party by furnishing them the only live issues they have, although they are revolutionary and reactionary.

Mr. President, we might as well resist the beginning of these things here and now if it is possible. I object to the Government owning railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, and an armor-plate factory or engaging in any business that the citizens of the country can legitimately engage in.

The Senator from South Carolina claims to be accurate, and reads from reports he has studied for five years to show his vast information and how accurate he is on so technical a question as manufacturing armor plate. Now, let us test his accuracy by the RECORD. He said the vote in the House was only 10 majority—

Mr. TILLMAN. Fifteen.

Mr. ELKINS. Eighteen.

Mr. TILLMAN. Fifteen.

Mr. ELKINS. I have in my hand the RECORD. The vote was 107 yeas and 125 nays. The majority was 18. Why did you say 10? And then correct it by another mistake and declare it was 15, when the RECORD says it was 18? If the Senator's information about armor plate is as inaccurate as his information about the proceedings of the House, with the RECORD before him, he should not be trusted, though he claims to be an expert and well informed on armor plate. How can we believe the Senator's expert knowledge, though aided by the Senator from New Hampshire, another expert on this subject?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is such a magnificent discovery that in glancing at the figures I did not make the subtraction correctly in my head, that I leave the Senator from West Virginia all the honor and glory he can get out of it.

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator said at first the majority was 10, and the RECORD says 18. That is a very wide difference; it is nearly double. Now, discounting what the Senator said about armor plate that much, I think you will bring the price up to \$450 per ton that the Senator opposes so much. The Senator says armor plate should cost only \$300 per ton. Now, if he is out of the way and mistaken only 50 per cent, this would bring the price up to \$450 per ton. In the matter of the House vote he was out of range nearly 100 per cent. Too bad for an expert.

Mr. President, business men do these things upon business principles. The proper and businesslike way would be to leave the price, not to exceed a given amount, to the Secretary of the Navy. In England the British Government votes its budget annually for the navy and the other great departments of the Government in bulk and holds the ministers responsible under a criminal statute for the expenditure of the money, putting no limitation upon them. The British Parliament trusts the Government ministers. It reposes confidence in their judgment, ability, and integrity.

Senators can afford to trust the Secretary of the Navy and hold him responsible. He is under oath, as we are. Having the advantage of the advice of the best experts on the subject, he is far less liable to make a mistake than Senators who are mere laymen and have no expert knowledge on making armor plate and what it should cost.

The Senate not only wants to place a limitation on the Secretary, but it wants to fix the price absolutely that he shall pay for armor plate. The Senate is without expert knowledge. The Secretary of the Navy has at his elbow some of the ablest experts in the world to advise him upon this question. When he comes to invite bids for armor plate, he can call his experts and he can say to them, "Are the bids fair or not? Are they too high?" And if he is advised that the price is too high he can and will reject all bids and report to Congress. Does anyone believe that the Secretary of the Navy would do the Government of the United States any injustice—that he would lend himself to any combine or any trust any more than Senators? It is impossible.

Mr. President, I think we should trust the executive department of the nation. I think we should intrust it with the expenditure of the public money. In this instance, since there has been so much discussion, I am willing to place a limit on the amount to be paid and let the Secretary of the Navy act within his discretion, and if he can not get the price that he thinks armor plate ought to be furnished for, stop the building of ships and report to Congress at its next session for its action. We can decide then about building an armor-plate factory.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire says that in every instance the Secretary of the Navy has been obliged to pay the price demanded by the armor-plate factories. This may be true, but in no instance has the Secretary of the Navy ever had the power to pay a certain price or build a factory, as is proposed by the House in the proposition brought forward in the conference report. Secretary Herbert, when retiring from power at the end of Cleveland's Administration, recommended precisely this proposition.

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow me to ask a question?

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. CAFFERY. I understand the Senator to say that in the House proposition a certain price is limited or in the alternative we are to build an armor factory?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAFFERY. I much misapprehend the reading of the report if the House conference amendment does not leave to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy the price to be paid.

Mr. ELKINS. A reasonable price. It says a reasonable price, or he is to build an armor-plate factory.

Mr. CAFFERY. Does the Senator call the price fixed by the House any price left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I would be willing to trust the Senator from Louisiana to fix a reasonable price upon anything in the administration of any office he might hold under the Government.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. ELKINS. I am willing to trust the Secretary of the Navy, advised by great experts, as to what price he should pay up to a given sum named as a limit.

Mr. CAFFERY. If I were Secretary of the Navy I would decline that imperial crown.

Mr. ELKINS. The Secretary of the Navy, the executive, can not shrink from responsibility. There are \$15,000,000 involved in this question, I understand. We vote \$115,000,000 to the Postmaster-General to expend in one year. We place no limit upon what he shall pay. We vote to the Secretary of War, to carry out a river and harbor act, sixty and seventy million dollars, and he is not bound to spend nor does he often spend all of the appropriation in any given case. He advertises for bids and he takes the lowest responsible bidder, and in many cases saves 20 and sometimes 30 per cent on the amount appropriated. Now, why is it that in this armor-plate question, involving as it does a large sum in one way, but not as large as other Departments expend, we can not trust \$15,000,000 to the Secretary of the Navy and let the responsibility rest upon him?

You can not administer government without trusting to somebody. Responsibility must fall upon somebody, and if it falls in this case upon the Secretary of the Navy, who is an able, honest,

and fearless man, as all admit and no one questions it, and advised by a great staff, I think, Mr. President, that the Government of the United States will not be despoiled, robbed, and cheated, as some imagine. I am sure it will not be.

Now, I do not understand all this talk about the great dangers of a combine. I do not see the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in his seat. He thinks that the armor-plate people are going to take the Government by the throat, and if they can not get the Government by the throat they must take 75,000,000 people by the throat. I do not know why the Senator is so apprehensive or fears that possibly he may be robbed before he gets home after this session by armor-plate people or some trust or combine. I do not think the people of the United States are in danger of the trusts and combines to the extent that the Senator seems to feel.

We can pay or not pay the price asked by any trust or combine. We are at entire liberty to pay for armor plate just what we think it is worth, and what the officers of the Government think it is worth and not one dollar more, and the combine can not force the Government, when the discretion rests with the Secretary of the Navy to pay a reasonable or a just price, to pay more than this price. The armor-plate combine can not oblige the Secretary of the Navy to pay more for armor plate than he honestly thinks he should pay. All this talk about the combine taking 75,000,000 people by the throat and forcing them to give up the public funds is purely for campaign purposes, and should have no place in a proper effort to dispose of purely a business question upon business principles.

Mr. President, the position of the House, as I said before, is precisely the position of ex-Secretary Herbert; and why should it be attacked here in the Senate? It is an independent body, entitled to the same consideration and respect for its opinion as the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I am willing to leave this matter to the conferees, and I believe they will bring in a report that will be just and one we can sustain.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, this discussion has brought out the fact that the friends of the trusts and combinations are in the saddle. Of all the interesting questions that have been before the Senate during the winter respecting our foreign relations and other important matters, they have not been of sufficient importance to bring out any remarks from the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] or the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. But when we touch one of the great industrial trusts that threatens to rob the Government of millions of dollars, and an attempt is made to destroy its influence, that moment these gentlemen appear upon the floor as the advocates of this great octopus and undertake to persuade Senators that the Government ought not to engage in the occupation of manufacturing armor plate, but should stand up and be rifled at the will of this organization.

The Senator from Ohio asserts with considerable strength and vehemence that he knows all about armor plate. Although he is not engaged in manufacturing the kind we want to buy, yet he asseverates with great strength that his knowledge of its cost and of the profit is accurate and indisputable. I infer that he means to imply at least that those of us who disagree with him are mere pigmies in this field of knowledge, and that whatever we may say should be whistled down the wind without any attention, while the greatest attention and the greatest consideration should be given to his assertions.

The Senator from Ohio will not be able, in my judgment, to brush aside with a wave of his hand and a strong assertion the history that has been formed within the last few years respecting this very interesting subject.

Mr. Secretary Herbert, of the Navy Department, a few years ago made a lengthy report covering a great many pages and a very careful report on the subject of the frauds in the manufacture and sale of armor plate and the cost of armor plate. It was not a loosely drawn document. It was carefully prepared by that able man after an exhaustive research into all the facts that were obtainable at that time. He asserts in that report that armor plate, the harveyized plate, can be manufactured and sold to the Government at a profit at \$192 a ton. Against this careful report and this careful investigation by Secretary Herbert we have the assertions of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia.

I am rather inclined to believe that if the Government could not save some money by the erection of an armor plant, if it were a profit-losing rather than a profit-making transaction, these protests would not come so thick and fierce and fast, and the Government would be permitted without any objection to undertake the enterprise.

One of the arguments used by the Senator from Ohio in support of his position is that somebody has cast some reflection or may cast some reflection upon the honorable Secretary of the Navy. I have never heard a breath of suspicion against that eminent man in my life, neither here nor elsewhere, and I do not

believe there is a Senator in this Chamber who would so belittle himself and so minimize his influence among his associates as to assert or imply that there is anything questionable about the honesty and capacity of that eminent officer.

But, Mr. President, that is not the question. That is not the question before the Senate. This is a Congressional duty. It is the duty of Congress to legislate, and not the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to legislate. It is our duty to authorize the construction of vessels and to determine the class of vessels we will have constructed. It is our duty to fix the amount of money that shall be used in the construction of vessels and, if we see fit, to limit the price that shall be paid for vessels and that shall be paid for the material that goes into their construction. And because we do not see fit to abandon this plain, constitutional, imperative duty and turn it over to an executive officer, where it does not properly belong, it does not follow that any imputation is placed upon the capacity or character of that officer.

But, Mr. President, I am led to believe that the Senator from Ohio was not conscious of any charge that had been made against this officer, or any imputation against him, but that this argument was used as a mere specious sort of argument to whip into line those who might be reluctant otherwise to turn over this far-reaching and dangerous power to him.

The Senator from West Virginia, of course, follows in the wake of the Senator from Ohio. He, too, knows all about the price of armor plate. The Senators seem to think that no other person, however skilled he may be in reading or investigating facts, can know anything about this particularly interesting subject but themselves. Great is knowledge, Mr. President, and great is the man who possesses a monopoly of it.

But the Senator from West Virginia could not restrain his desire to run into party politics. Directing his attention to this side of the Chamber, and to a few of us who are Populists and not Republicans or Democrats, he said he saw a few days ago that the Populists in my State had put in their platform something about the Government ownership of railroads. Mr. President, the Populists of my State have not met in State convention thus far. So the Senator was either mistaken about the State in which he saw this doctrine announced, or he had been reading the platform which was adopted by the national Populist convention nine years ago.

Indeed, the Senator from West Virginia spoke as though he thought this was a novel doctrine. I have no doubt he was entirely honest, and entirely ignorant, too, of the fact that 85 per cent of the nations own and operate their own railroads and have done so since railroads came into existence. The United States and England, to which he referred as an example for us to follow, are the only two nations upon the face of the globe where the railroads are owned and operated exclusively by private individuals or private corporations. Yet I have no doubt the Senator from West Virginia, in the fullness of his knowledge, has never discovered that fact.

So it is not a new thing, Mr. President. The State of Georgia built and owns and operates a railroad, unless she sold it recently. Railroads were built in the State of Michigan and owned and operated by that State, and in half a dozen other States of the Union; and that, too, Mr. President, long before the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from West Virginia or myself opened our eyes to the light of the world. It is not a very novel doctrine. This Government owns a ship canal. It owns canals of different kinds and properties that are used as semiprivate property. There is nothing new or startling in this doctrine, except that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia would have the Government stand and deliver to these private organizations whenever they see fit to demand revenues at our hands.

I will not be unkind enough to say or to intimate that the Carnegie Steel Company and the Bethlehem Works have made and intend to make the political armor of the Republican party in politics by their contributions. I leave that question to the future. Therefore, there is some interest, of course, in protecting their rights or protecting them in their demands upon this Government.

Mr. President, it is idle to say, it would be a foolish thing to say before children 10 years of age, not to mention men of large experience in the world, that this Government, with all its resources, can not build and operate an armor plant and build armor plate more cheaply than any private institution. I ask the Senator from Ohio if we do not to-day manufacture the best parts of our cannon, whether for use on land or on sea, at our navy-yards?

Mr. HANNA. I will answer that question if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HANNA. All the United States Government do in the manufacture of cannon is to put the steel together, which is manufactured at Bethlehem for them at an expense of about \$700 a ton.

Mr. ALLEN. We manufacture at Government expense and under Government direction the very best armament for naval or land defenses that is manufactured upon the face of the earth.

Mr. HANNA. No; we only finish it.

Mr. ALLEN. If we can finish it, Mr. President, we can begin at the beginning and make it and finish it, too; and it is idle to assert to the contrary and expect anybody to believe the assertion.

Mr. President, I am not here to talk politics; I am not here to criticize any public officer in the discharge of his duty; I am not here to question the good faith of any man; but I am here to question the good faith of the Carnegie steel works and the Bethlehem works when they come here through their agents and friends and protest against the Government entering upon the manufacture of armor plate such as we must have for the use of the Government, and thus we will avoid these frauds and scandals and we will avoid these exorbitant prices. If the Government can not manufacture these things as cheaply as can these corporations, they ought to be willing that we test the question. A year or two years will demonstrate the fact; and then we shall know whether we can do the work successfully or not, or whether we must turn the business over to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report of the conference committee.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not care to delay the Senate any length of time in the discussion of this question, but after what has been said here I am disposed to express my opinion about this case.

As usual, those of us who do not agree with certain members of this body or certain people in the country are charged with some ulterior purpose. We are now, because we are not willing that the Government should pay an unreasonable sum for armor plate, charged with a desire to prevent the increase of the Navy. Why, Mr. President, long before the Senator from Ohio came into this Senate, or, so far as I know, had any influence in political or public affairs, I stood here advocating the increase of the Navy. There never has been such a bill proposed here that I did not vote for if it contained a provision for an increase of the Navy, nor such an amendment proposed which I did not support with my voice as well as my vote.

But, Mr. President, this is now the new method: If you do not agree with the Administration of public affairs as now carried on you are either guilty of treason or of some other crime; if you do not quite subscribe to the imperialistic ideas which are now abroad, you are guilty of treason; and if you are not willing the Government shall be robbed—I repeat the term, though it is objectionable to the Senator from West Virginia, and probably to the Senator from Ohio—if you are not willing the Government shall be robbed by the armor-plate combine, then, of course, you are against the Navy.

I said—and I repeat it—I would rather the Navy would stand still for the next five years, while we were building an armor plant, than that the Government should submit to be held up by these combines. If I thought the Government would suffer seriously, I should not be willing that should be done; but I believe, in the condition of the world's affairs, we can safely suspend operations for a time.

Mr. President, I am not frightened by the declaration made by the Senator from Ohio that we can not build an armor plant in five years. I never engaged in the business of making iron; I do not pretend to any special knowledge of it; but I do know that Carnegie, not taking his old plant, as the Senator said, but beginning from the ground up, made an entire plant for armor plate and had it in full operation inside of a year. Mr. Carnegie may do some things that the Government of the United States can not do, but when it comes to an enterprise of that kind there is no private concern that can beat the Government if the Government is in proper hands. If it takes five years to build an armor plant in this country, it will be because those who are in charge of the executive department of the Government want to give these combines five years more to make us pay extortionate sums for armor plate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend for a moment. It is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business which is the bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there is another thing as to which I have some complaint. When we decline to put into the hands of an executive officer power that we think he ought not to exercise, it is no reflection upon him, although the Senator from Connecticut seemed to think that it was some reflection upon the Secretary of the Navy because we were not willing to grant

him unlimited power. Our whole Government goes upon the theory that we do not grant unlimited power to our executive. Why did the fathers of the Constitution provide that we should in making appropriations determine what the public money should be used for? It was not because they were afraid that the executive department of the Government would steal the money, but because the executive department does not represent the people as does the legislative department. It is inconsistent with a republic that they should, Mr. President. The executive department is to execute the law which the legislative department has registered.

In these modern days, Mr. President, the legislative department of the Government is being sunk into insignificance and the executive department elevated. That is the tendency. I know that was the tendency under a late Administration presided over by a Democrat; and that is the tendency intensified under this Administration. Every time we say we would like to restrict the power of the Executive, then we are charged with abuse or with criticism or with suggesting that the Secretary of the Navy may steal or that the President may commit some crime.

Mr. President, that does not frighten me. I believe in the checks and balances that the fathers of the Constitution, the originators of this system of government of ours, put upon affairs in this country. It is not our place to turn over to the Secretary of the Navy and make him take the responsibility which belongs here. The Senator from New Hampshire spoke of that as a cowardly performance; and so I think I shall be justified in saying that it seems to me to be a cowardly performance. When we say, "It is a difficult question," the reply is, "You have got to meet these great combines; they will be heard in the next election; and we think perhaps on the whole you had better turn this over and let the Secretary of the Navy wrestle with it; he is but one man, and we will escape the responsibility." I do not propose to do it. I believe it is the duty of this Congress to fix the price we are willing to pay for armor plate, and I am willing, so far as I can, to take the responsibility in that matter.

The Senator from West Virginia seemed to think that the terms "taking the Government by the throat" and "taking the people by the throat" were terms not to be used in this body. Mr. President, if there ever was in the history of this country a case where the Government of the United States has been taken by the throat by corporate power it is in this case of armor plate.

Why have we not built an armor-plate plant, Mr. President? Is it not because these corporations have taken the legislative branch, as well as the executive branch, practically, by the throat? It is because they have made the legislative department feel that it is not safe to take this step and interfere with their opportunities of compelling the Government to pay an extortionate price. The Senator from Ohio says that he knows that the price is not extortionate. I prefer to rely upon the committee of this Senate and the committee of the House of Representatives, which looked into this affair, when there was at the head of the Navy Department—

Mr. HANNA. May I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. HANNA. I should like to know when that investigation was made by that committee?

Mr. TELLER. It was made a few years ago.

Mr. HANNA. How many years ago?

Mr. TELLER. Four or five years ago, I think. I do not remember precisely.

Mr. HANNA. Is the Senator aware of the marked change of conditions since that time?

Mr. TELLER. I am. I understand it.

An investigation was made when there was at the head of the Navy Department a man whose character was equal to that of the present Secretary. There is no question about that.

Mr. HANNA. I am not speaking about the character of men.

Mr. TELLER. I will come to the point the Senator wants me to come to. I will tell him why, perhaps, there is a difference in conditions, and particularly why prices are up. But, Mr. President, after careful consideration and a nonpartisan consideration, the committee declared that for \$300 or less per ton armor plate could be made at a profit; and they were buttressed and supported by the fact that these concerns were selling armor plate to foreign powers and carrying it across the sea, with freight paid, and selling it at \$50 or \$60 a ton less than \$300. I suppose the Senator wants the country to believe that these armor companies were carrying plate to Russia and selling it at a loss. Nobody believes that, not even the Senator from Ohio.

There are other conditions. Not only is the Democratic party not in power, but there are other conditions to which the Senator wants to attract my attention; and that is that prices have risen, he says, 25 per cent. So prices have risen in this country. I do not know, but I will venture the assertion that they will fall 25 per cent in the course of the next year. Why did prices rise? Because of the combination of the great industrial concerns of this country who manufacture iron and steel. When one man

fixed the price or any number of men have congregated together and fixed the price of iron and steel, the price rose. When there was no longer that guardian of trade and commerce—competition—when these combinations determined what the output should be, and when they determined what the price should be, then prices went up.

The price of iron and steel went up, Mr. President, not on a just and righteous demand. One day we were notified that cut nails had gone up 65 cents a hundred, because the trust had fixed upon them an additional price. Within thirty days they added 15 cents more on the hundred pounds. Here were 65 cents and 15 cents more added, making 80 cents on a hundred pounds. Cut nails, which had been sold in the community in which I live at retail for \$2 a keg, went to \$8 a keg. Does anybody believe that it cost any more to make those nails when they sold for \$8 a keg than when they sold for \$2? If they did, it was because there was some fault in the method of making nails, for they had not increased the pay of labor to any considerable extent in those concerns, certainly not to an extent which would justify an increase of 5 per cent.

Mr. HANNA. If the Senator will allow me, I will state to him that it is a fact that those concerns advanced the wages of their men 30 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. They advanced the wages of the men over what they had paid them in the great panic. When the panic came they put the wages down, and when the panic was over they put them up. It cost as much in labor to make nails that were sold at \$1.90 a keg as it cost when they sent them out at \$6 and \$7 a keg, and when they compelled every retail dealer in the United States to sell their product at the figure they fixed, which they had done all over the country; and what is true of nails is true of iron generally.

I know there is a different condition, and I know if the Government of the United States goes into the manufacture of armor plates they have got to pay an additional price for them, or they have got to buy the pig iron or steel, or they have got to go to work in the ground and manufacture it from the crude ore—one or the other.

Mr. President, I do not like to engage in any political discussion here. I think I have been as clear of that as anybody. I have said very little about politics in the last year or two, and I do not intend to say very much upon that subject now; but when the chief representative of the Republican party in the United States on this floor—and I speak advisedly when I say that—comes here and defends what has been said by many of his own political friends here was a robbery, I think I am justified in saying that the Republican party expect to repeat in 1900 what they did in 1896, when they made an assessment upon every manufacturing concern in the United States to sustain their candidate.

Mr. HANNA. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. HANNA. I want to deny any such insinuation or statement as that, for it is not true.

Mr. TELLER. I knew, of course, that the Senator would dispute it. Perhaps one can not say technically that it was an assessment. Of course there was no power in the national Republican committee to make such an assessment; but I do say, Mr. President, that there was not a national bank in the United States, not one, not even in my own State, that did not receive a demand for a contribution to the Republican campaign fund.

Mr. HANNA. Allow me to answer that.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. HANNA. The First National Bank of Denver, Colo., was the recipient of all the contributions; the president of that bank was the solicitor-general of the contributions that were made in Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. For whom?

Mr. HANNA. For the Democratic party.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that, but the amount raised was inconsequential.

Mr. HANNA. A few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. TELLER. No, sir; it was not \$200,000. I myself know every dollar that went through that bank.

Mr. HANNA. So do I.

Mr. TELLER. Then the Senator knows that \$200,000 never went through it. He knows that \$100,000 never went through it.

Mr. HANNA. I know there was over \$100,000.

Mr. TELLER. No, sir; there was not over \$100,000. I know as much about that as the Senator can know, and a great deal more.

Mr. HANNA. I have authority for the statement.

Mr. TELLER. I repeat that demands were made upon bank after bank in my State, as well as in the State of Illinois and other States, as I have been told by their officers. Of course you can not say that technically they were assessments. I repeat, there was not a great concern in the United States that was producing articles for sale but what was called upon by that committee for

contributions; and they generally got them, and generally got them from the banks, and I suppose that will be done again. That may account for some of the interest in these people who are making armor plate and who fix the price.

The other day when we were discussing the question it was said here that one of these great manufacturers, "Mr. Carnegie, is a Bryan man; he is supporting Bryan." I challenged that statement, Mr. President. I do not believe that he had ever said at any time that he was going to support Mr. Bryan. If he had, he made it very clear when he reached the other side of the water in a public interview, which was telegraphed all over the world, that he was against Bryan and was for McKinley. I do not suppose that had anything to do with this armor-plate matter. I am not going to make such a claim, because Mr. Carnegie was supporting Mr. McKinley in 1896. I do not know that he ever made the utterances indicated, that he was not going to support Mr. McKinley in 1900; but I know more than that. I know that the class of men to which he belongs felt it to be to their interest to elect McKinley in 1896, and they feel that it is to their interest to reelect him in 1900. It may be that it is; but I do not believe it is if they are honestly producing articles and expect to submit to the legitimate rules of commerce and trade.

I did not mean to say all this, Mr. President—not but what it is true, and there is a great deal more that might be said. A fair statement of the condition of the campaign in 1896, and a full knowledge by the American people of the methods and means used, would, I think, upset this Administration in an hour, if there was a method to upset it here such as they have in Great Britain.

Mr. President, on this conference report I do not care about speaking of the inconsistencies of this Administration, then or now; but I want to enter my protest, so far as I am concerned, against this matter even having a suggestion of politics in it. I believe we can build an armor-plate plant and that we can put it in full operation and can be making plates inside of fifteen months. If we can not do it now, I propose that we shall wait six months longer or a year longer.

I want to say another thing. I think the provision that came here originally from the House was a very much better proposition for us than the proposition that is now being insisted upon by the House. Let us stop and buy armor plate and submit to the extortion that may be necessary for the three ships that are now ready for the armor plate to be put on them. The others, which are not ready, can wait, whether we build an armor plant or whether we do not. If we come here next winter and find that the Secretary of the Navy has been compelled to pay an extortionate sum—I am speaking now upon the theory that the House will not consent to building an armor plant now—we can build it then.

But I object to allowing the Secretary of the Navy authority to buy armor plate for all these ships—those ordered in this bill and those that are in the course of construction—and not place any limit or restriction whatever upon him, authorizing or requiring him to buy, and then coming here next winter and finding fault, perhaps, with the exercise of discretion on his part. Let us determine what we will do in the matter, or else say to the Secretary, "Buy armor plate only for the three ships that are now needing it, and wait until we get ready to put the armor plate upon the other ships, which we will not be ready to do for the next year or two."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Maine please state what is the motion made by him?

Mr. HALE. The first motion is that the report of the conference committee be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to accept the report of the conference committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Maine state his next proposition?

Mr. HALE. The next proposition is that the Senate insist on its amendment, which is a distinctive proposition, and disagree to the amendment of the House thereto, and ask for a further conference.

Mr. CHANDLER. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator ask for the yeas and nays on the entire proposition?

Mr. CHANDLER. I supposed the Senator would move to adhere to the Senate amendment and disagree to the House amendment. That is what I want the yeas and nays upon.

Mr. FORAKER. The proposition on which the yeas and nays are now called for, as I understand, covers all three points of difference; that is, it covers the question as to the course of instruction of the naval cadets—that is, the two years' course at sea before a cadet can be commissioned—

Mr. HALE. It includes all of those.

Mr. FORAKER. I would ask that that might be omitted, for

I do not want that we shall insist upon a six years' course at the Naval Academy. I should like to have that omitted; but if there is no way to separate it, of course we must deal with the entire question.

Mr. HALE. Of course there is no way to separate these questions. I will make the motions in detail, and will first move that the Senate insist on its amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion now made is that the Senate insist—

Mr. FORAKER. Can we not have a vote upon the amendments separately? I do not understand why we can not take a separate vote on each one of these amendments about which there is a difference between the Houses.

I do not want to instruct the conferees to insist upon the three amendments, two of which I favor and to one of which I am opposed, if I can avoid it. The result may be the same, and I suppose it will be; but I do not want to be put into the attitude of voting against my own view on two of these matters.

Mr. HALE. The Senate was very strong upon that matter after full discussion and it was decided by a vote of more than two to one.

Mr. FORAKER. That is true.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator think it will help now to take another vote on that question?

Mr. FORAKER. I say I do not want to be put in the attitude of having to yield the opinion I have on the extension of the course at the Naval Academy.

Mr. HALE. But we have to do such things every day.

Mr. FORAKER. I suppose so.

Mr. HALE. Let the vote be taken on the motion that the Senate insist on its amendments, and then I shall be ready for a vote on disagreeing to the House amendment, on which the yeas and nays can be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate insist on its amendments to the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is there to be a motion to reject the House amendment?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I have stated that I will make that motion.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the question I want the yeas and nays upon.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can have the yeas and nays afterwards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to the amendment of the Senate, and upon that Senators desire that the yeas and nays be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives made to the amendment of the Senate, and upon that motion the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has demanded the yeas and yeas.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I do not know that I particularly care to discuss this question at this time; but it seems to me entirely appropriate, under the circumstances, that we should rehearse that which has been often stated—the admitted facts in this connection. In the first place, it has been admitted time and again that the two existing armor-plate factories in this country were built out of the profits of armor plate which they furnished the United States; it has been admitted that these two factories are in collusion; that there is no competition between them, but that they divide the quantity of armor plate furnished; that they divide the profits, agreeing in advance upon the prices they will charge the Government. It has been admitted that these armor-plate factories sold armor plate in Europe for \$250 a ton in 1895.

Now, these are the admitted facts. In the face of these facts—

Mr. HANNA. I should like to ask the Senator a question for information. Does he know how much the Russian Government is paying the United States manufacturers for Krupp armor?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not know. Neither do I care what they are paying. They paid in 1895 \$250 a ton.

Mr. HANNA. I will tell the Senator that they are paying \$565 a ton.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Within a week it has been stated upon this floor and admitted that every armor-plate factory in the world is in a combination to rob the governments to which they furnish plate. So the Russian Government, according to the statement of the Senator from Ohio, is to-day paying \$545 a ton, that being the international price, or \$300 a ton more than the price at which our manufacturers furnished it to them before the combination was made.

In the face of these facts how can we refuse to build an armor-plate factory? What argument can be presented? Who disputes the facts? No one. We are told about the difficulty of getting experts. If we build an armor-plate factory there will be no other

customer but the Government, and we will have command, at reasonable wages, at our own prices, of every armor-plate expert in the United States. If we build a plant and make our own armor, the factories having no other customer, will have no use for the armor-plate experts, and we can employ them. Why is it that we are now asked to recede? Why is it we are asked to adopt the House amendment? Is it because we believe if we leave it to the Secretary of the Navy we will get armor plate for less than \$445 a ton?

Mr. HALE. The Senator understands that the committee does not ask the Senate to recede, but asks it to insist and not to agree.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I understand; but what called forth the speeches from the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia except to make preparation for the Senate to recede? Do you think those gentlemen advocated it because they thought the Secretary of the Navy would get a less price than \$445 a ton? No. They certainly advocated it because they believed they would get a higher price.

Mr. HANNA. How does the Senator know?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I know because I learn something from observation and experience. I know because in 1892 the Republican party collected from the Cramp Company and from Cramp \$400,000 in cash to make their campaign, on the promise that he should recoup the money out of the ships he was to build. Of course if the Secretary of the Navy lets the contract and we pay \$545 instead of \$445 a ton on 35,000 tons the difference is three millions and a half, and the contributions, instead of being \$400,000, can run into the million.

No wonder, then, that the men who collected the funds for the campaign of 1896 stand upon this floor and champion this, because it will be easier to secure the contributions; this is the source.

Yet we are charged with delaying the construction of the Navy. Have we not advocated—those of us who objected to this combination price, to this hold-up of the Government of the United States—from the beginning of this controversy the construction of an armor-plate factory? Is not that proof conclusive that we are not trying to prevent the building of a navy, and rather that we were trying to prevent a combination from plundering the Treasury? Suppose we had begun the construction of the plant four years ago, when this controversy first commenced? It would have been completed long ago, and the armor-plate controversy would have been eliminated from our politics. But it was not the purpose of those who could gain contributions from this combination to have the controversy eliminated. So long as they can continue this policy just so long can they get the funds—just so long can they secure the contributions.

I think the conferees ought to be instructed by this body to agree to nothing but the immediate construction of an armor-plate plant. Let us pay what we have to pay for the plates we must get before we construct a plant, and let us make the appropriation necessary to construct and make it at once. There ought to be no compromise upon any other foundation. If we start now, within one year we will have the plant, and in my opinion it will not cost half the profit that we will be compelled to pay upon the present needs of the Government, even at \$445 a ton.

It is said that experts only shall be allowed to testify or to express an opinion upon this subject; but a man who is not an expert, a man who has not been engaged in the manufacture of steel or of steels, a man who has not made wire nails or wire, a man who is not engaged in the production of iron, can weigh evidence; and when the testimony comes to us from our own Navy Department that the plates can be made at a cost of \$200 a ton, when our manufacturers, who are now holding us up, have sold the plate to European governments at \$250 a ton, it seems to me we have a right to pass judgment upon this evidence, and there is no occasion for our deferring our judgment to the men who have been engaged in the steal industry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on disagreeing to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not understand the parliamentary situation here. The Senate has voted to insist on its amendments to this bill and to return it to the conferees.

Mr. HALE. No. Following that I moved that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to our amendment, and that is the question which is now before the Senate, and upon it the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. Notwithstanding that the Senate has agreed and has voted to insist on its amendments.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. And refers the subject back to the conferees, so far as our vote is concerned.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not yet.

Mr. HALE. That has not been done.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the necessary effect.

Mr. HALE. It is when we complete the proceeding. When we disagree to their amendment and accede to the request for a further conference, then it goes to the conferees.

Mr. MORGAN. I have never before heard of the Senate taking up a House amendment or a House proposed amendment and disagreeing to it. I understand the proper procedure to be this—

Mr. HALE. I do not think it is customary, but undoubtedly it can be done.

Mr. MORGAN. It is not customary, and it is not parliamentary, in my judgment—a poor one, I confess; but at the same time I think I understand it to my own satisfaction. The proper proceeding in this case has been accomplished—that is to say, we insisted upon the amendments of the Senate, and the next motion would be to refer it back to the committee. The effect of the motion as it is now presented to the Senate, to disagree to the House amendment, is simply an adherence to what the Senate has done. In the parliamentary usage in regard to matters of this kind there is first a conference, a free conference, and after the report comes in, if the Senate insists upon its amendment, it is sent back for full and free conference. If the two Houses still disagree and the matter comes before the Senate, we can either further insist or we can adhere.

If we vote to adhere to our amendment, that loses the bill, unless the House concurs in our amendment. That is all of it. That is the true parliamentary situation. We have got the two motions mixed here, the effect of one of which is to adhere and the other to insist.

Mr. HALE. By no means, if the Senator will allow me. The motion to adhere is a formal, specific, well-recognized, and conclusive motion. It ends the matter. It puts a stop to the conference. There is no further conference where either body votes to adhere.

Mr. MORGAN. I have so stated.

Mr. HALE. Nothing of that kind is done. Only the motion which is customary, to insist on the Senate amendment and to disagree to the House amendment thereto, has been divided, and at Senators' request it is made in two motions. But it has no such effect as the Senator apprehends, of putting a stop to the conference or the effect of passing a vote to adhere. It goes back to the conference at once, and the other side sees what the feeling of the Senate is with regard to their amendment. It seemed to me, when the suggestion was made that the motion should be divided, that it was a fair suggestion; that it was parliamentary, because it did not take away any rights; and it does not in any way foreclose, I can assure the Senator, a further conference. It has no such effect, and I think the Chair would so rule upon it.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Maine confesses that it is rather a novel proceeding.

Mr. HALE. I have said I do not think it is customary.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think the Senator ever heard of it before.

Mr. HALE. I do not know that it has been done before.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think he did.

Mr. HALE. I do not know that it has been done before, and yet I see no objection to it.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think anybody else ever heard of it. If we get through this proceeding to-day, if this proposition is passed in the affirmative, we shall notify the House that we adhere to our amendment and therefore adhere to our disagreement to the amendment of the House, and that will be the effect of it. So we are proceeding—I am not objecting to it—in a way that will kill this bill unless the House recedes from its amendment to our amendment. The bill will go by the board.

Mr. ALLISON. Although I am not familiar with the rule, I think the parliamentary situation as respects this bill is this: We have now voted to insist upon our amendments in dispute, but we have not yet dealt with the House amendments to our amendments. Unless we take some action in respect to those amendments, the conferees will not have the whole subject-matter before them. Although, as the Senator from Maine says, it is not the usual proceeding, it is a necessary proceeding; and whenever it has been necessary, it has been passed upon by the Senate, but usually in one motion. I have made several motions of this character, when the House has amended an amendment of the Senate, and I have always asked that it be put in the form of insisting upon the Senate amendment and disagreeing to the House amendment.

Mr. HALE. One motion.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; it has usually gone in one motion. I would myself very much have preferred that the motion should have been taken as a whole, because for myself I should be glad to concur in one of the amendments we are now voting to disagree to. That is the amendment relating to the surveys. I do not believe we should settle that question on an appropriation bill in this form. But inasmuch as the vote is to be taken upon both amendments, I am willing, in a pro forma way, to vote upon them as a disagreement, expressing my own views. So I do not think at all, if the Senator from Alabama will allow me, that the parliamentary situation is in the slightest degree changed by a yea-

and-nay vote upon the proposition of disagreeing to the House amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to say a word?

Mr. MORGAN. In insisting upon the amendment of the Senate, as we have done by a vote, we disagree to their amendment. The bill came over here. It originated there. The Senate amended it, and it has gone back, and the House has amended not only our amendment, but their own bill at the same time. In insisting upon our amendment, we disagree to the House amendment. That is clear and plain. That is the necessary effect.

Mr. HALE. The form is always the other way. We deal with both, first insisting upon our own amendments and disagreeing to their amendments thereto; but it has always been, as the Senator from Iowa says, put in one motion. We always incorporate the two.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to say a word, as I called for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I called for the yeas and nays simply in order to get an expression of the Senate to guide the conferees. The point I wanted the expression on was whether the Senate would be willing to give unlimited discretion to the Secretary of the Navy to make a price for armor. I should have been content to call the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator as one motion—a motion to insist upon the Senate amendment and to disagree to the House amendment to the Senate amendment—but the Senator from Maine suggested that it could be divided. Therefore I yielded to him. I will be perfectly satisfied, if that will suit the Senator from Alabama any better, to have the yeas and nays taken on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment and disagree to the House amendment to that amendment. That will be only one motion. We can have the yeas and nays on that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I am not making any technical question about it at all. I merely wanted to state that in my opinion, and that is the view on which I shall give my vote on it, when we now, after insisting upon our own amendment, by a vote go further and say we disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, it is an adherence, and that that ends the bill. And so I shall vote.

One other matter. I am not prepared to vote intelligently on this subject without asking some questions from the chairman of the committee, which I do in perfect sincerity and in order to get from that enlightened and proper source of knowledge certain facts about this business. I will ask the chairman of the committee what is now the cost per ton of steel for armor plate?

Mr. HALE. At what stage of manufacture?

Mr. MORGAN. Steel; steel ingots, of course.

Mr. HALE. Steel ingots?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. MORGAN. He can not state it?

Mr. HALE. It is very small; I suppose about a cent and a half a pound; something like that.

Mr. MORGAN. About thirty-seven and a half dollars a ton?

Mr. HALE. A cent and three-quarters per pound.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I do not know; I can not tell exactly.

Mr. TILLMAN. That would be after you had added the nickel. The crude steel, ordinary steel, Bessemer steel, could hardly be worth anything like that. That would be after you had added nickel. You would have to add nickel to make it \$37 a ton.

Mr. MORGAN. The next question I desire information on is this: What is the cost per ton of the nickel or chrome or other foreign material that is used in the Harvey process and also in the Krupp process?

Mr. HALE. In the Krupp process I think they claim it is something more than \$20.

Mr. MORGAN. How about the Harvey process?

Mr. HALE. I do not know.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator does not know. In making armor plate at this date I understand it is not considered safe to make it unless you use the Harvey process and also the Krupp process or one or the other, the Krupp process being probably preferable. I understand that is true.

Mr. HALE. It is claimed that the Krupp process, of course hardens it more—hardens it deeper.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HALE. It carries the hardening process farther into the plate.

Mr. BUTLER. But at the same time the Senator should state that the weight of the sheet of armor by the Krupp process is less than the weight by the Harvey process, they claim, and a thinner sheet will have the same resistance.

Mr. HALE. The last statement is true.

Mr. BUTLER. Therefore the difference in weight would make

up the difference in extra cost, as they claim, because for a hundred dollars you get more pounds.

Mr. MORGAN. The next question I wish to ask the Senator is this: What is the royalty on the Harvey process?

Mr. HALE. That has been disputed. It is half a cent a pound.

Mr. MORGAN. Half a cent a pound?

Mr. HALE. Yes; about \$11 per ton.

Mr. MORGAN. Eleven dollars per ton. What is the royalty on the Krupp process?

Mr. HALE. It is claimed to be from forty-five to fifty dollars.

Mr. MORGAN. We have now got all the material that goes into armor plate. We have everything but the labor, the skill, the special information of persons who are supposed to be wiser than all the balance of the world in the manufacture of armor plate.

The object of my questions is to justify the statement made in 1897 in the report of the Hon. Hilary A. Herbert, then Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Herbert, as I am proud to say, is an Alabamian and one of great reputation for his conservatism and his integrity and his good sense and practical wisdom in the conduct of the Navy Department. He made a report here, a very excellent one, in which he adopted the highest figures that had been submitted to him by experts, persons of full knowledge on the subject in regard to this same matter about which I have been asking the chairman of the committee some questions. You have heard what the chairman said. Now, Mr. Herbert says, quoting from the Rohrer board, which examined into this subject:

The items constituting the heads under which the calculations of the Rohrer board were made are summarized as follows:

Materials in ingot.....	\$30.13
Mr. BUTLER. A ton?	
Mr. MORGAN. A ton:	
Materials in ingot.....	\$30.13
Materials consumed in manufacture.....	58.75
Labor.....	43.50
Keeping plant ready for use.....	9.80
Shop expenses.....	2.38
Office expenses and contingencies.....	3.34
Administration, superintendence, and engineering.....	21.40
Total.....	167.30

That is the total cost now of manufactured armor plate.

Mr. HANNA. What kind of plate?

Mr. MORGAN. The harveyized. The report is dated June 8, 1897. Mr. Herbert added a very slight increase upon certain items in that statement, bringing the whole total cost of a ton to \$197.78. The statement made by the chairman of the committee to us to-day shows the cost as he understands it of this same material, including the royalty on the Harvey patent and also under the Krupp patent, and putting in every item of cost in this matter, of the material and of the patent royalty, which Mr. Herbert included, without noticing the labor that is necessary to be performed and the skill that is necessary to employ for the purpose of manufacturing this armor plate. So Mr. Herbert is fully justified, more than justified, making allowance for the increase through the prosperity of the country of the prices of this material and the price of labor, and making an allowance of three or four hundred per cent upon these prices, he is still, according to the statement of the chairman of the committee, justified in the estimates he made in 1897.

I can not see it in any other light than that it is an abuse of the United States, through a combination of armor-plate producers, which we ought to resent and resist, and if they have got the power over us to prevent us from building ships, if they can stop us, let them do it and take the responsibility. I think we have got ships enough now to fight all the battles in which we shall engage in the next seven or eight years, and whenever they make up their minds that they intend to force the United States to the establishment of an armor-plate factory, then they will find out and we will find out that we are independent of them, and that we have the power to conduct all the necessary operations of this Government without the assistance of a combination of corporations in this country.

The Senator from Connecticut was chairman of a committee of this body, called the "committee on war ships and ordnance," of which I had the honor to be a member also, and it was his suggestion that we should take the old navy-yard here and convert it into a gun factory. It was considered at that time to be a dangerous proposition and one wherein the Government of the United States would be exposed to great cost and peril in establishing it, but it was established. The guns have been made. They have fought the battles of the Spanish war. Better guns were never made in the world than are made right here in this gun factory in Washington. That is a perfect demonstration of the capacity of the Government of the United States safely and economically and successfully to conduct an establishment of this kind. And if we have to buy the steel billets from factories about over the United States, without putting up furnaces for

the purpose of making the steel, and then we harveyize and kruppize them and we put our other material into them according to the scientific requirements of the occasion, we will have no greater difficulty in executing that matter than we have had in this gun factory.

It is exactly a parallel case. We have there the object lesson by which we can measure all of our dangers and all of our responsibilities and also the vast amount of profits saved to the Treasury of the United States against this combination. That is all I desire to say about it.

Mr. HALE. I am entirely willing, if the point of order troubles the Senator from Alabama, to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which it insisted on its amendments, and then have the vote on the whole proposition, which we can clearly do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine make that request?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate further insisted upon its amendments may be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Now the Senator from Maine renews his motion that the Senate insist upon its amendments and disagree to the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. That is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CHANDLER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to say one word before the question is put. I intend to vote with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in this matter. I do so not that I have any sympathy with the attitude taken by many Senators upon this question to-day in their disagreement with the House, but in the sincere hope that another conference may bring about a practical, businesslike, sensible adjustment of this most important and most complicated question. I therefore shall vote with him, not as any evidence of my conviction upon the question, but that the matter may again be got into conference, and perhaps solved in a satisfactory manner.

I desire again to call attention to the amendment which, by unanimous consent, I offered yesterday, which was laid on the table and which is printed to-day, and of which I have a copy. My amendment is that we shall adhere to the action of the Senate in adopting the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which committee adopted what is commonly known as the Vandiver amendment. That amendment provides that the Government of the United States shall contract at \$545 a ton for the armor for the three ships at present being constructed, and the remainder of the armor required by the Government shall be contracted for at the figure of \$445 per ton; and if the Secretary of the Navy is not able to get the armor at that figure, then he shall proceed to build an armor plant, and the appropriation of some \$2,000,000 is made for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the Senator that I think he has stated a little incorrectly the effect of the amendment. It was that the Secretary of the Navy should attempt to get a contract at \$445; and that if he could not make a contract for all of it at \$445, then he should be permitted to pay as high as \$545 for the three ships now being constructed and proceed at once to build an armor factory.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is correct. I perhaps did not state the amendment as plainly as I might have done.

Now, Mr. President, in the opinion of most of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that amendment was considered to be most ingeniously constructed to place the Government in command of the situation and at the same time to place a reasonable limitation upon the price of armor.

It has further been maintained by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from South Carolina that the Krupp process is only a fiction and a pretext for further basis of extortion on the part of these companies, and that no royalty can be legally or fairly exacted in the manufacture of this improved armor. Therefore my amendment provides that the Government shall pay the royalty. I make no other alteration in the Vandiver amendment already adopted by the Senate but to alter the word "inclusive" and insert the word "exclusive," and to make two other verbal amendments. The amendment is closely in line with the action of the Senate; it is closely in line with what was thought wise and expedient by the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have also inserted an amendment which will doubtless meet the full approval of the Senator from South Carolina, and that is that in case an armor plant is considered necessary and expedient it shall be located in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I understand and I insist that an amendment at this stage of the proceedings is out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that anyone has offered an amendment. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], that the Senate further insist on its amendments and disagree to the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEITFELD (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TURLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]; but I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea," and I will accordingly vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I ask if the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. I am paired with that Senator, and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after Mr. FRYE had voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Maine is paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], but the junior Senator from Maine will allow his vote to stand.

Mr. McMILLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 0; as follows:

YEAS—63.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Kyle,	Quarles,
Allen,	Deboe,	McBride,	Rawlins,
Allison,	Fairbanks,	McComas,	Ross,
Bacon,	Foraker,	McCumber,	Scott,
Baker,	Foster,	McEnery,	Sewell,
Bate,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Shoup,
Beveridge,	Gallinger,	Mallory,	Simon,
Burrows,	Gear,	Martin,	Sullivan,
Butler,	Hale,	Mason,	Taliaferro,
Caffery,	Hanna,	Morgan,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Clay,	Harris,	Perkins,	Tillman,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Turley,
Culberson,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Kean,	Pritchard,	Wetmore,
Daniel,	Kenney,	Proctor,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—23.

Bard,	Elkins,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Berry,	Hawley,	Money,	Turner,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Nelson,	Vest,
Chilton,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Clark,	Lindsay,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott,
Depew,	Lodge,	Spooner,	

So Mr. HALE's motion that the Senate insist on its amendments and disagree to the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference; and Mr. HALE, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. TILLMAN were appointed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 31st ultimo approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

An act (S. 4615) to facilitate the entry of steamships engaged in the coasting trade between Porto Rico and the Territory of Hawaii and the United States; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 76) withdrawing certain lands on the island of Oahu, Hawaii, from the public domain.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SEWELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the West Point Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call attention to the fact that there was a unanimous-consent agreement, made on the 28th day of May, that after the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill thirty minutes should be given to the Committee on Pensions for unobjected pension cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is true; unanimous consent was given that thirty minutes shall be allowed for pension bills.

Mr. SEWELL. I appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire. We have two appropriation bills not yet passed; and if we are going to adjourn in any reasonable time, those bills ought to be

passed in order to go into conference. There will be no trouble about passing the pension bills after the appropriation bills are out of the way.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to make an appeal in my behalf, and then perhaps we can make an adjustment.

I will say to the Senator that there are 200 pension bills on the Calendar and at least six Senators have brought bills to me to-day which have just passed the House, urging that they be reported. Almost every Senator and about one-half the Members of the House of Representatives are pursuing me about the Capitol and urging that these pension bills shall be passed in the near future; and in self-defense I have got to insist upon some consideration for this order.

I am quite willing to make an adjustment if I can get my time some time in the near future, but it will be remembered that when the sundry civil bill was under consideration the suggestion was made that it would take one day, and I think it took four days. I am willing to come here this evening, if the Senate will give me that privilege.

Mr. SEWELL. There are only two bills that ought to have preference above everything else—the Military Academy bill and the deficiency bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no question about that. I recognize that fact.

Mr. SEWELL. I am willing that the Senate shall fix a time for the consideration of pension bills. In fact, I am anxious that it shall do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that at fifteen minutes past 5 o'clock this afternoon unobjected pension cases shall be considered for forty-five minutes.

Mr. SEWELL. I agree to that.

Mr. HALE. I do not want to object to that request, but what is very desirable to-day, as I said last night, in order to arrange conferences, is that not only the Military Academy appropriation bill shall be passed to-day, but the deficiency appropriation bill. If the Senator comes in and breaks up the afternoon, that will destroy the chance of passing the deficiency bill to-night.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask for a change of the unanimous-consent agreement so that one hour shall be given for the consideration of unobjected pension bills after the Military Academy appropriation bill and the deficiency appropriation bill shall have been considered, but I want to couple that with the suggestion that probably the pension bills that will then be passed will not become laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate consent to this request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HOAR. I desire to say something before consenting, if I may be permitted, as other Senators have been allowed. There is a measure from the Judiciary Committee in regard to the extradition of criminals who have committed offenses in Cuba and have fled to the United States. We are all of us responsible, with scarcely an exception, for the condition of things in Cuba. We all of us, with scarcely an exception, heartily approved the war and the policy which have driven Spain out of Cuba and which have put the United States in that island temporarily. I do not suppose there is any member of this body who does not consider that it would be a public scandal if American criminals, high or low, are to go to that island and plunder the people and, if they can get two or three hours ahead of detection, make their escape to this country as to an Alsatia.

Now, there is no hurry about the final adjournment. If we do not adjourn on Wednesday, we can adjourn on Thursday. It is not a session like the one when the 4th of March ends our constitutional power. It seems to me that the appropriation bills themselves ought to wait an hour or two until we can make an arrangement by which these criminals shall be sent back to Cuba.

Now, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, which is to substitute, by unanimous consent, for a time already agreed on for the pension bills another time, which will be more convenient. But I do insist that the extradition bill ought to be pressed on the attention of the Senate, adjournment or no adjournment, appropriation bill or no appropriation bill, and passed at an early date.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is possible that I can make a suggestion that will better suit the convenience of the Senate. It is that a recess be taken at the close of this afternoon's session until 8 o'clock this evening, and that the time from 8 until 9 o'clock this evening be given to the consideration of unobjected pension bills, no other business to be transacted.

Mr. HALE. I would not object to that except that I may have to ask the Senate, as I shall, to stay here until 7 or 8 o'clock in order to pass the deficiency bill to-night. There will be no chance for a recess.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well; there is objection, and I will leave it as formerly stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator make any request now?

Mr. ALDRICH. It has been agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator from Maine ask to have a session to-night?

Mr. MASON. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire make a request?

Mr. GALLINGER. I made a request, which I understand is not agreed to. I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be changed so that the Pension Calendar shall be taken up for one hour at the conclusion of the consideration of the Military Academy bill and the deficiency bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask the Senator to include the emergency river and harbor bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I do that I will never get the pension bills through.

Mr. CULLOM. There will be plenty of time for that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unobjected pension cases may be considered after the West Point bill and the deficiency bill are disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. For one hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MASON. I object. I call for the regular order. I objected twice. There has been unanimous consent given to take thirty minutes now for the pension bills, and they are more important than some other measures that are being pressed. Thirty minutes will not injure business, and we have agreed upon it, and I object to a change of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. MASON. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the regular order?

Mr. MASON. The regular order is the unanimous consent given to take up the pension bills at this hour, as I understand it.

Mr. HALE. Not at this hour.

Mr. SEWELL. The regular order is the Military Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. MASON. The pension bills were to be taken up immediately after finishing the appropriation bill that has just been finished.

Mr. HALE. That appropriation bill was finished last night. That order has lapsed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not concede that. The Senator has an easy way of disposing of parliamentary matters. I stated last evening—

Several SENATORS. Let the agreement be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be read. Of course if we are going to be technical, somebody can make a motion.

Mr. KYLE. Have we finished the morning business yet?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is not in order now. It can only be received by unanimous consent.

Mr. KYLE. I ask for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent the Secretary will read the unanimous-consent agreement that was given touching pension bills. The Chair does not make any ruling about unanimous-consent agreements. It is not in his power to do it. The Senate determines it.

Mr. HALE. Let the Senator from New Hampshire go on with the pension bills now. We have already spent thirty minutes.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; go on now.

Mr. HALE. Let the Senator go on now. Let the Senator from New Jersey get his bill up and then yield.

Mr. SEWELL. The appropriation bill has been taken up, I understand.

Mr. HALE. Let us go on with the pension bills for thirty minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the West Point appropriation bill is before the Senate. The Senator from New Jersey yields to the unanimous-consent order of the Senate given for the consideration for thirty minutes of pension bills on the Calendar. Will the Senator from New Hampshire consent that morning business may be received? If it is not now received, it will be dribbling all day long.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly, if it is not taken out of the thirty minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Reports of committees are first in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THURSTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10899) to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9389) to authorize the Seneca Telephone Company to construct and maintain lines in the Indian Territory, reported it without amendment.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4834) granting a pension to Otto Haltnorth, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1930) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9047) to incorporate the Washington Telephone Company and to permit it to install, maintain, and operate a telephone plant and exchanges in the District of Columbia, to report it without expression of opinion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9701) granting a pension to Jonah Duncan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4587) granting an increase of pension to Cora Van D. Chenoweth, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2879) granting a pension to Mary E. Griffiths, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4203) for the relief of George K. Bowen, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2214) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas H. Thorp and William Mullally, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

EXCLUSION FROM SUFFRAGE.

Mr. CHANDLER. I report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be instructed to inquire and report whether an enactment, by constitution or otherwise, by any State which confers the right to vote upon any of its citizens because of their descent from certain persons or classes of persons, and excludes other citizens because they are not descended from such persons or classes of persons, the persons so excluded having all other qualifications prescribed by law, is in violation of the Constitution of the United States and of the fundamental principle of our republican form of government; and also whether citizens so excluded can lawfully be reckoned in determining the number of Representatives from any State in the House of Representatives of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TURLEY. I object to the present consideration of the resolution. It is not a report of the entire committee, and I ask that it go over or go on the Calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ought to have stated that it is the report of a majority of the committee. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee, if there is objection, I will ask that the resolution may go upon the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes to the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4916) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 4917) for the relief of George T. Sampson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to introduce a bill with an accompanying document. I desire to say that I introduce it by request simply, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The bill (S. 4918) to authorize the Secretary of War to constitute a department of marine in the insular government of the island of Cuba, and to reopen to commerce the arsenal at Havana under the charge of a competent insular officer, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 4919) for the relief of Lytle A. Rather, administrator of the estate of William B. Lumpkin, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4920) for the relief of W. A. Sanford, administrator of the estate of H. B. Bloxam, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 4921) for the relief of W. E. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 4922) to establish a standard

of wages for women employed by the Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4923) granting a pension to Alonzo Sabin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4924) granting a pension to Adella M. Anthony; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 4925) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Contal; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11881) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Muscogee or Creek tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11820) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Cherokee tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCENERY submitted an amendment relative to an appropriation to pay the claim of Nehemiah Harvey and others, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURNER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$220,674.24 to pay amounts found by commissioners of the Court of Claims to be due to letter carriers under the act of May 24, 1888, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF THE RENAULT GRANT.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if there is any money in the Treasury, the proceeds in whole or in part of the sale to Lynn and Pratt, or any other person or persons, of the Mine LaMott, in the State of Missouri, embracing about 23,040 acres, and the Little Marame tract of land in the State of Illinois, embracing about 11,520 acres and, if so, how much, when and under what circumstances it was deposited. And the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, further directed to inform the Senate of the full history of the grants, transfers, and sale or sales of said tracts of land, respectively, to date, said lands having originally been granted about the year 1740 to one Phillip Francis Renault.

CHARLES GALLAGHER.

Mr. CHANDLER. At the suggestion of the Committee on Claims, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1623) entitled "For the relief of Charles Gallagher, of New York, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION TESTIMONY.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, inasmuch as there has been considerable criticism of the action of the Industrial Commission with reference to the so-called Lockwood testimony, I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD, in addition to what I incorporated the other day, a letter from Professor Jenks, of Cornell University. He is the expert agent of the Industrial Commission touching the trust question and has written a letter covering the whole of the question. He had been instructed by the commission to go over this testimony, by line and by paragraph, with Mr. Lockwood. This he did, and this is his letter explaining the whole situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What does the Senator request?

Mr. KYLE. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITHACA, N. Y., May 31, 1900.

DEAR SENATOR: I see in the papers of yesterday and to-day some statements regarding the alleged suppression of Mr. Lockwood's testimony. I edited all that testimony myself, went through it very carefully indeed two or three times, and discussed the whole matter thoroughly with Mr. Lockwood. The accounts in the paper are very decidedly mistaken. In the first place, the only thing that was suppressed at all was the direct attack upon Judge Haight, of the court of appeals of the State of New York. Lockwood had practically charged that Haight had been bought by the Standard Oil Company, and that his election to the court of appeals had been bought

about through the corrupt influences of the Standard Oil Company. When he was asked if he had any facts on which to base this charge, he acknowledged that the opinion was based simply upon general rumor and the general charges made at the time of the campaign. He had no specific knowledge whatever of a personal nature.

Under those circumstances the commission thought it wrong to circulate, at the Government's expense, what was presumably an actionable libel as long as Mr. Lockwood himself distinctly acknowledged that he had no definite information on the subject. He was told repeatedly that if he had definite information it would be printed. On the other hand, he was allowed to make statements, in general, to the effect that the Standard Oil Company had, in his judgment, bribed the courts and secured the election of judges to the higher courts. (Page 389.)

The statement in the New York Times of May 30 that everything relating to the case of Matthews was stricken out is a mistake. The whole story of Matthews is retained in the testimony on page 389, with the exception of the specific reference to Judge Haight.

It is also stated in this same paper that "Lockwood argued that the Standard Oil Company could not be attacked so long as it had the cooperation of the railroads, and that therefore the only remedy against trusts was Government ownership of the railroads. Every allusion of Lockwood to this remedy was stricken out." This statement is distinctly not true. Allusions of Lockwood to this remedy are in the testimony on pages 391, 392, 394. Every allusion that Lockwood himself made to that remedy or to any other remains still in the testimony.

It is possible that Lockwood's own report of his testimony shows one or two of these minor matters that are apparently stricken out. The explanation of that is this: That Lockwood's own report of his testimony is an incorrect one, or, at any rate, it is one that differs from the report given by our stenographers. Mr. Lockwood, I presume, published his report as that paper was written. On the other hand, all of those who heard Mr. Lockwood give his testimony know that he read his paper in what he would call, I suppose, a decidedly oratorical style, frequently raising his eyes, making elaborate gestures, inserting remarks not in the paper, or replying to questions, and then afterwards going back to his manuscript. In more than one instance where he said that words or expressions had been omitted, I not merely compared the stenographers' report very carefully and found from that that the words had never been uttered, but I took especial pains to have the stenographers bring me their original notes and read those parts over again so as to be certain that Lockwood had never used those expressions in the presence of the commission. The fact is plainly this: That in his oratorical efforts in addressing the commission and the public at large he looked away from his manuscript, and when he returned to the manuscript he inadvertently skipped a sentence or so. I did not feel at liberty to insert matter that did not appear at all in the stenographers' notes.

On the other hand, there was nothing of that kind that was of any consequence omitted, nor anything that in the least affected the full expression of his opinions. The parts omitted on that ground may possibly have been rather more emphatic statements than some that he put in, but there was absolutely nothing new in the idea. A statement is made again in the Times in the following words: "Another evidence of discrimination was shown in the editing of the following: 'What is the remedy?' 'The control of the public highways is the most important duty of the Government.' The commission left the question standing and struck out the answer." That is wrong. On page 391 of the testimony this passage appears as follows: "What is the remedy?" "Take the railroads away from the corporations; make them public property; let the Government own and run them; make them highways over which the people can go to market upon even terms."

Whatever Mr. Lockwood says that he said in answer to the question, this is what he really did say, according to the stenographers, and this is all reported. In another place, where he asks the same question, the report appears as follows (page 388): "Now, what is the remedy?" "There is practically no remedy in the courts; they are too slow and expensive. These great railway combinations in cooperation with the trust organizations can 'razoo' a man up and down through the courts from one to another for ten long years, until he is financially exhausted and his business ruined." The simple fact in the matter is this: The only thing that was suppressed in Mr. Lockwood's testimony was an actionable libel against one of the members of the court of appeals of the State of New York, which Mr. Lockwood himself before he left the stand confessed was uttered without any knowledge on his own part, but was a mere repetition of a campaign rumor.

There were two or three other places where mere repetitions of his were shortened; presumably others were slightly changed where grammatical errors occurred owing to carelessness in utterance as he was speaking extemporaneously, but there is absolutely no other case where there is the slightest change in meaning of anything that Mr. Lockwood said. Knowing Mr. Lockwood's disposition on this subject, and having reason to believe the fact that even contrary to what was apparently his judgment after I had talked the matter over with him, he was being pushed forward to make this trouble by Mr. Martin, who had failed of an appointment by the commission which he had wished to secure, and by some others apparently who had presumably political partisan ends to serve, I retained every scrap of the original notes of the testimony, retained Mr. Lockwood's own copy of the report as printed, with all of the changes made in it. I am positive that in fifteen minutes I can convince any committee of the Senate or any fair-minded Senator to whatever party he belongs, that Mr. Lockwood's testimony was edited in an absolutely fair way.

The only failure of the Industrial Commission in the trust investigation was not a failure that was due in any sense to any partisan feelings, but was due to the fact that Congress had apparently not given the commission sufficient power as regards the summoning of witnesses. It was a matter of doubt as to whether, if witnesses refused to appear, they could be punished for contempt. On that account, as well as from courtesy, the commission invited witnesses, and in no case issued a subpoena. In two or three cases witnesses refused to come, and the commission thought it unwise to attempt to force them when their counsel advised them that it might be impossible to compel their attendance. Two witnesses who did not come were J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Henry Seligman.

Their testimony was wanted in connection with the financing of the Federal Steel Company and of the American Steel and Wire Company. The commission did not push the matter to an issue, because it did not wish to take any risk of failure in so doing. It would be wise if the commission is extended to make this question of its power over witnesses an absolutely sure one. The chances are that it has some power that way now, beyond the mere reporting to Congress, but that is not certain. I should like to say that I know that in no case did partisanship have anything whatever to do with determining the witnesses that should be summoned, or with their examination. I know this, because, generally speaking, the witnesses were summoned whom I recommended. In most cases I did not know what their party affiliations were, and in no case did I care.

If you will have Mr. Durand or Mr. Edgerton look up the original notes on Lockwood's testimony, you will find these statements that I have made borne out; or I could myself come to Washington and straighten the matter up, if it were necessary. I think, however, that the material is in such shape that

Durand could do it just as well, and it is very difficult for me to get away just at examination time.

Very sincerely, yours,

JEREMIAH W. JENKS,
Expert Agent.

Senator JAMES H. KYLE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

EXTRADITION WITH CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first pension case on the Calendar will be stated.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. GALLINGER], will allow me, I wish to give notice that after the Senate has concluded the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill, in charge of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 11719, being the extradition bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS subsequently said: A few moments ago I gave notice that after the conclusion of the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill I would ask for the consideration of the extradition bill. I understand that the Senator from Maine desires to bring before the Senate the general deficiency appropriation bill as soon as the Military Academy bill is concluded. I will ask unanimous consent that the extradition bill may be the regular order—

Mr. ALDRICH. To be taken up.

Mr. HALE. That it be taken up.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up after the general deficiency bill is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PENSIONS TO EX-CONFEDERATES.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business 608, being the bill (S. 2500) for the repeal of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes, may be included in the order just made. It is a pension bill. If any debate is precipitated, I will withdraw it. It has been reported by the Committee on Pensions with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator want that bill considered now?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have it included in the order and considered now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2500) for the repeal of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART. I do not object, but I want to know what it is.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is an amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be read, and then I shall make a brief explanation regarding the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions will be stated.

The Secretary read the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions, which was, after the word "repealed," at the end of the bill, to add:

Provided, however, That no name of any pensioner which may have been dropped from the rolls under the provisions of this section shall be restored thereto, nor that of any person whose application for pension has been rejected, or who may hereafter apply for pension, shall be placed thereon prior to the date of filing an application after the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 4716, Revised Statutes, be, and the same are hereby, repealed: *Provided, however,* That no name of any pensioner which may have been dropped from the rolls under the provisions of this section shall be restored thereto, nor that of any person whose application for pension has been rejected, or who may hereafter apply for pension, shall be placed thereon prior to the date of filing an application after the passage of this act.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I intend to briefly explain the bill, which, I think, will not take many minutes. If there shall be objection to it, I shall withdraw it.

Section 4716 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

No money on account of pension shall be paid to any person, or to the widow, children, or heirs of any deceased person, who in any manner voluntarily engaged in or aided or abetted the late rebellion against the authority of the United States.

On March 3, 1877, that enactment was amended so as to provide that those who voluntarily left the Confederate service and came to the Union service should be exempt. We have passed through the Senate at this session an act exempting the dependent children of soldiers of the Confederate army. This simply repeals that statute, but provides that as to those who might have had a pension under the laws had this statute not existed, and who shall make a new application, the pension shall commence from the time of filing that application.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I should like to have that bill go over so that I may have an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN] has withdrawn his objection to Senate bill 2500, and I ask that its consideration be resumed.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read, and also the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out the word "this," at the end of line 6, and inserting "such;" so as to read:

Dropped from the rolls under the provisions of such section shall be restored, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, when this unanimous consent was given to the consideration of pension bills at a certain time, I gave notice that I should object to the consideration of all House bills, simply because I felt aggrieved at the action of the House on a bill increasing the pension of an old Mexican veteran who lost an arm in 1847, upon which I have been unable to get any favorable action in the body sitting at the other end of the Capitol. After maturely considering the matter—and I have had the toothache this week, so that I have had a great many sleepless hours and full opportunity to think over my sins and those of other people [laughter]—I decided that such action on my part would be unwarranted, for this reason:

The committee which has charge of the bill which I had sent to the other end of the Capitol is not the committee which sends these bills here; it is an entirely different committee from the one against which I have a grievance, if there be one. I have decided, further, that by refusing to allow these bills to go through I would be working an injury or a wrong, perhaps, to persons who were meritorious and deserving of an increase of pension. Moreover, it occurred to me that I would be trying to wreak vengeance on innocent parties. As I never did admire the dog in the manger, I have concluded that I would withdraw my opposition and let the bills go through, and depend on the good sense and the sense of fairness and justice of the House in dealing with these questions when they get a chance, and I am sure they will get a chance at some time.

JOSEPH B. M'GAHAN.

The bill (H. R. 10581) granting a pension to Joseph B. McGahan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph B. McGahan, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUSSELL L. MOORE.

The bill (H. R. 9826) granting an increase of pension to Russell L. Moore was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Russell L. Moore, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

The bill (H. R. 6990) granting a pension to Patrick O'Donnell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Patrick O'Donnell, late of Company K, Fifth United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES F. WINCH.

The bill (H. R. 538) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Winch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles F. Winch, late first lieutenant Company K, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID H. INGERSON.

The bill (H. R. 5549) granting an increase of pension to David H. Ingerson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David H. Ingerson, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE B. LEITCH.

The bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Leitch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lizzie B. Leitch, widow of Robert Rose Leitch, late chief engineer, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$25 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT PATTERSON.

The bill (H. R. 7588) granting a pension to Robert Patterson, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Patterson, late a nurse in the Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET J. KIBBLE.

The bill (H. R. 8992) granting a pension to Margaret J. Kibble was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret J. Kibble, widow of Joseph A. Kibble, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE B. ABBOTT.

The bill (H. R. 10412) granting an increase of pension to George B. Abbott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George B. Abbott, late of Company G, Thirty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERBERT J. GRAFF.

The bill (H. R. 10870) granting a pension to Herbert J. Graff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Herbert J. Graff, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry; Company F, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH H. SPARKS.

The bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Sparks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph H. Sparks, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BYRON F. DAVIS.

The bill (H. R. 5804) granting a pension to Byron F. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Byron F. Davis, late first lieutenant and adjutant, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

TIMOTHY A. LEWIS.

The bill (H. R. 8404) granting an increase of pension to Timothy A. Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Timothy A. Lewis, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHRISTOPHER COSTELLO.

The bill (H. R. 8476) granting a pension to Christopher Costello was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension roll the name of Christopher Costello, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension rated according to the degree of his disability from injury of head and epilepsy.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STELLA B. ARMSTRONG.

The bill (H. R. 9175) granting an increase of pension to Stella B. Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Stella B. Armstrong, widow of Maj. Frank C. Armstrong, Thirty-second United States Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARIANA F. WILLS.

The bill (S. 3669) granting an increase of pension to Ariana F. Wills was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out the article "a;" in line 7, after the word "lieutenant," to strike out "of the;" and in the same line, after the word "Twenty-second," to insert "Regiment;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ariana F. Wills, widow of John Howard Wills, late first lieutenant, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 8, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "twenty-five;" and in line 9, after the word "month," to insert the words "and \$2 per month additional for the minor child of said John Howard Wills until said child reaches the age of 16 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH J. FIELDS.

The bill (H. R. 8592) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Fields was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth J. Fields, dependent mother of Robert J. Fields, late private, Company D, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSE F. GATES.

The bill (S. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Jesse F. Gates was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Battery," to strike out "private, Light" and insert "of;" in line 7, before the word "Artillery," to insert "Regiment United States;" and in the same line, after the word "Artillery," to strike out "United States Army;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jesse F. Gates, late of Battery A, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. BARRETT.

The bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to James M. Barrett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Barrett, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York

Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM A. HEMPSTEAD.

The bill (H. R. 9775) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hempstead was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William A. Hempstead, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE WORTHINGTON WINTHROP.

The bill (S. 4259) granting an increase of pension to Alice Worthington Winthrop was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alice Worthington Winthrop, widow of William Winthrop, late colonel and assistant judge-advocate-general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA E. LITTLEFIELD.

The bill (S. 4191) granting a pension to Anna E. Littlefield was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna E. Littlefield, widow of Milton S. Littlefield, late colonel Twenty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT A. ROBERTS.

The bill (S. 4548) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Roberts was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Albert A. Roberts, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVIN N. SABIN.

The bill (S. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Alvin N. Sabin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "captain" and insert "first lieutenant Company K, and captain Company C;" in line 7, after the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Infantry" and insert "Cavalry;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alvin N. Sabin, late first lieutenant Company K, and captain Company C, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCES E. CHILDS.

The bill (S. 4296) granting an increase of pension to Frances S. Childs was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with

amendments, in line 6, before the name "Childs," to strike out the initial "S." and insert "E.;" in the same line, before the name "Jonathan," to strike out "Colonel," and in line 7, after the word "late," to strike out "of the" and insert "colonel;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Frances E. Childs, widow of Jonathan W. Childs, late colonel Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Childs."

CHARLES H. ADAMS.

The bill (H. R. 602) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the name "Adams," to insert the initial "H.;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles H. Adams, late of Company C, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN HURLBURT.

The bill (H. R. 3513) granting a pension to Edwin Hurlburt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edwin Hurlburt, late captain Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERMAN S. SOULES.

The bill (H. R. 9236) granting an increase of pension to Herman S. Soules was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Herman S. Soules, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH S. SEYMOUR.

The bill (H. R. 10719) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Seymour was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth S. Seymour, widow of George W. Seymour, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARISSA CARRUTH.

The bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to Clarissa Carruth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Clarissa Carruth, widow of Sumner Carruth, late lieutenant-colonel Thirty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERTHA G. KIMBALL.

The bill (H. R. 10455) granting an increase of pension to Bertha G. Kimball was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Bertha G. Kimball, widow of Frederick C. Kimball, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster of the Fifth United States Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$22 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Frederick C. Kimball until they reach the age of 16 years.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISAAC N. JENNINGS.

The bill (H. R. 4424) granting a pension to Isaac N. Jennings, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Isaac N. Jennings, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT ANDERSON, JR.

The bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to Robert Anderson, jr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Anderson, jr., late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE DE VECCHJ.

The bill (H. R. 8475) granting an increase of pension to Alice de Vecchj was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the name "de Vecchj," to strike out "Archille" and insert "Achille," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alice de Vecchj, widow of Achille de Vecchj, late captain, Ninth Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FRANKLIN KERSTING.

The bill (S. 2163) granting a pension to Franklin Kersting was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a member;" in line 7, before the word "Ohio," to insert "Regiment;" and after the word "Ohio" to strike out "Volunteers" and insert "Volunteer Infantry;" and in line 9, after the word "of," to strike out "the pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Franklin Kersting, late of Company E, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Franklin Kersting."

ELIJAH BIDDLE.

The bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Biddle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elijah Biddle, late private, Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 a month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY O'CONNOR.

The bill (H. R. 8888) granting an increase of pension to Henry O'Connor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry O'Connor, late major Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 a month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN V. MCLEERY.

The bill (H. R. 1748) granting a pension to Ellen V. McCleery was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ellen V. McCleery, widow of Samuel McGill, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM E. FERREE.

The bill (S. 2913) granting an increase of pension to William E. Ferree was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William E. Ferree, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Iowa Cavalry Volunteers, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL Z. MURPHY.

The bill (S. 2915) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Z. Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Z. Murphy, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRUS A. B. FOX.

The bill (S. 63) granting a pension to Cyrus A. B. Fox was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cyrus A. B. Fox, late of Company H, Eighty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. B. Fox."

THOMAS WHITE.

The bill (S. 4178) granting a pension to Thomas White was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas White, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and United States Signal Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES COOPER.

The bill (H. R. 852) granting an increase of pension to James Cooper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Cooper, late of Company B, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYLVESTER DOSS.

The bill (H. R. 7186) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Doss, alias Harry S. Doss, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sylvester Doss, alias Harry S. Doss, late pilot of the ram *Lancaster*, Mississippi Marine Brigade, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. FULLERTON.

The bill (H. R. 6091) granting a pension to Mary A. Fullerton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. Fullerton, widow of Hugh S. Fullerton, late first lieutenant Company C, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$17 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRIETTA P. COTTER.

The bill (H. R. 9419) granting a pension to Henrietta P. Cotter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henrietta P. Cotter, widow of John S. Cotter, late captain Company K, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLIVER M. BROWN.

The bill (H. R. 7852) granting an increase of pension to Oliver M. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Oliver M. Brown, late major Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATILDA REEVES.

The bill (H. R. 5695) granting a pension to Matilda Reeves was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Matilda Reeves, widow of Manasseh Reeves, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. WENDELL.

The bill (H. R. 6425) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wendell, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Wendell, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL METCALF.

The bill (H. R. 8235) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Metcalf was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Daniel Metcalf, late of Company B, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. DENNISON.

The bill (H. R. 8236) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dennison was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Dennison, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARA H. M. MILEY.

The bill (H. R. 8835) granting an increase of pension to Sara H. M. Miley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sara H. M. Miley, widow of John D. Miley, late lieutenant-colonel and inspector-general, United States Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John D. Miley until they reach the age of 16 years.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA C. WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 10443) granting a pension to Anna C. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna C. White, widow of Thornton F. White, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH H. HAMRICK AND ELLA G. HAMRICK.

The bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick and Ella G. Hamrick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the names of Joseph H. Hamrick and Ella G. Hamrick, the blind and helpless children of Thomas H. Hamrick, late of Company K, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay them each a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET THORNBERRY.

The bill (H. R. 9752) granting a pension to Margaret Thornberry was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret Thornberry, widow of Samuel Milligan, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the time, and passed.

JAMES A. ROOT.

The bill (H. R. 2726) granting a pension to James A. Root was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James A. Root, late a member of Company K, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEVI G. WILGUS.

The bill (H. R. 3495) granting an increase of pension to Levi G. Wilgus was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Levi G. Wilgus, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BARTON ACUFF.

The bill (H. R. 5929) granting an increase of pension to Barton Acuff, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Barton Acuff, late member of Company G, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers in the Mexican war, and to pay him a pension of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM SHULMIRE.

The bill (H. R. 8211) granting an increase of pension to William Shulmire was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Shulmire, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD HARDEN.

The bill (H. R. 10612) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harden was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Richard Harden, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA CLARK.

The bill (S. 1588) granting a pension to Eva Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eva Clark, former widow of Joseph L. C. Hill, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIA TRAYNOR.

The bill (H. R. 6164) granting a pension to Julia Traynor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Julia Traynor, widow of Lawrence Traynor, late of the Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHARINE SLAYTON.

The bill (H. R. 7145) granting a pension to Catharine Slayton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Catharine Slayton, widow of Cary A. Slayton, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLIS P. PHIPPS.

The bill (S. 1978) granting an increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellis P. Phipps, late second and first lieutenant, Company A, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$90 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN BLANCHARD.

The bill (H. R. 6919) granting an increase of pension to John Blanchard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Blanchard, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSIE MARGARITE LANDRUM.

The bill (H. R. 1570) granting a pension to Susie Margarite Landrum was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Susie Margarite Landrum, widow of John J. Landrum, late lieutenant-colonel Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HUTCHENS.

The bill (S. 3941) granting an increase of pension to John Hutchens was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Hutchens, late of Captain Baker's company, Second Regiment Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Florida Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John Hutchens."

GENEVIEVE LAUGHTON.

The bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to Genevieve Laughton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Genevieve Laughton, widow of Samuel Laughton, late captain Company A, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUISE ADAMS.

The bill (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Louise Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Louise Adams, widow of Henry F. Adams, late assistant surgeon, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH ELVIRA C. UPHAM.

The bill (H. R. 9194) granting a pension to Sarah Elvira C. Upham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah Elvira C. Upham, widow of Frank K. Upham, late captain, First Cavalry, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA M. STARR.

The bill (H. R. 6464) granting a pension to Anna M. Starr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna M. Starr, widow of William C. Starr, late lieutenant-colonel Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE CRONK.

The bill (H. R. 9424) granting an increase of pension to George Cronk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George Cronk, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MADISON T. TRENT.

The bill (H. R. 9915) granting a pension to Madison T. Trent was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Madison T. Trent, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE LUCAS.

The bill (H. R. 1797) granting a pension to Jane Lucas was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight" and insert "twelve;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to strike out the article "a" and insert "per;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jane Lucas, dependent mother of Charles Lucas, late seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the committee amendments be disagreed to.

The amendments were rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. CAPEHART.

The bill (H. R. 2126) granting an increase of pension to William H. Capehart was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Capehart, late of Company A, First Battalion Alabama Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$16 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHIA A. LANE.

The bill (H. R. 9740) granting a pension to Sophia A. Lane was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sophia A. Lane, widow of James Sterling Lane, late private in Capt. John J. Floyd's company of Georgia Volunteers, Creek Indian war, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS J. JACKSON.

The bill (S. 1953) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Jackson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Thomas J. Jackson, of Newton, Kans., late lieutenant-colonel Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Troops (Infantry), a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move, in line 5, to strike out the words "of Newton, Kans.;" and in line 7 to strike out the word "pension" and insert "that."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

F. W. BAKER.

The bill (S. 1278) granting an increase of pension to F. W. Baker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "Regiment," to strike out "Tennessee Cavalry, and pay him a pension according to the degree of his disability," and insert "Tennessee Cavalry, and pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of F. W. Baker, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, and pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to insert the words "at the rate" before the word "of" in line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY IRENE ROSENTHAL.

The bill (S. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Mary Irene Rosenthal was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, after the word "Guard," to strike out "Volunteers" and insert "Volunteer Artillery;" in the same line, after the word "pension," to insert "at the rate," and in line 10, before the word "she," to strike out "pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Irene Rosenthal, widow of Levi Rosenthal, late of Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NANCY J. DUNAWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.). The time allotted to pension bills has expired.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that one other bill may be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. The next bill.

The bill (S. 1269) granting a pension to Nancy J. Dunaway, of Garnett, Kans., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "widow of," to strike out "the late;" in line 7, before the word "Forty-eighth," to strike out "who was a private in the" and insert "late of Company D;" and in line 8, after the word "Militia," to insert "and pay her a pension at \$12 per month;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nancy J. Dunaway, widow of John H. Dunaway, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Enrolled Militia, and pay her a pension at \$12 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move, in line 9, after the word "at," to insert "the rate of."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GALLINGER, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Nancy J. Dunaway."

PRIVILEGES OF SECOND-CLASS MAIL.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on House bill 10308.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10308) to extend to certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mails, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and accede to the request of the House for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BUTLER were appointed.

CHOCTAW LANDS IN MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 9083) to authorize the Commissioner of General Land Office to dispose of Choctaw orphan Indian lands in Mississippi, and to make appropriation for executing act of Congress approved June 28, 1898, was passed, and also move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. R. 49) to amend the Constitution of the United States, giving Congress the power to lay and collect income taxes, and the joint resolution (S. R. 47) proposing amendments to the Con-

stitution of the United States providing for the election of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by the qualified electors of the United States and for the election of other Federal judges by the votes of the qualified electors of the respective judicial circuits and districts, both of which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and unfavorably reported, may be put on the Calendar. I was not in the Chamber at the time, and the Chair announced that they were indefinitely postponed.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the request?

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that they may go on the Calendar.

Mr. ALDRICH. With the adverse reports?

Mr. PETTUS. Did those joint resolutions come from the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Chair will explain to the Senate that they were reported from the committee adversely and indefinitely postponed. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the votes postponing them be reconsidered and that they be placed on the Calendar with the adverse reports.

Mr. PETTUS. When was the postponement made?

Mr. BUTLER. On the 28th.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PETTUS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that he see the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and make some arrangement with him, so that the joint resolutions may be put on the Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. I will do that. I do not wish to interfere with other business, but I understand that a motion is in order to do that at any time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not in this case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that the time has passed within which such a motion can be made.

Mr. BUTLER. I will see the chairman of the committee.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the amendments of the committee may be first acted upon as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that course will be pursued.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 4, line 3, to increase the salary of 12 enlisted musicians from \$20 per month to \$25 per month, and, in line 4, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of 12 enlisted musicians from \$2,880 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 12, after the word "at," to insert "the rate of;" in the same line, after the word "day," to insert "of eight hours;" in line 13, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "seventy-five," and in line 14, before the word "cents," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed as watchman, at the rate of 35 cents per day of eight hours, \$175.65.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 25, after the word "regulations," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, further, That the allowance of extra pay, as provided for in the acts of February 10, 1897 (29 Stat. L., page 518), March 5, 1898 (30 Stat. L., page 255), and February 27, 1899 (30 Stat. L., page 295), and of extra-duty pay to enlisted men of the Army stationed at the Military Academy, who have been placed on extra duty in obedience to the orders of the superintendent, is hereby authorized and its payment directed, less the 20 per cent war increase already paid, the said payment being excepted from the operation of section 3691 of the Revised Statutes and section 6 of the act approved April 20, 1898 (30 Stat. L., page 365).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 18, before the word "Military," to insert "of;" in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy-seven" and insert "seventy-eight;" in the same line, before the word "hundred," to strike out "five" and insert "three;" in line 23, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eighty-five" and insert "fifty-three;" and in line 24, before the word "cents," to strike out "ninety-seven" and insert "sixty-nine;" so as to make the clause read:

In all, for pay of Military Academy Band, field musicians, general army service, cavalry detachment, artillery detachment, enlisted men on detached service and extra pay of enlisted men on special duty at the Military Academy, \$78,353.69.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 3, before the word "hundred," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" and in the same line, after the word dollars," to insert:

And section 1338 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1338. The master of the sword shall hereafter act as the instructor of military gymnastics and physical culture at the Military Academy, and shall have the relative rank and shall be entitled to the pay, allowances, and emoluments of a first lieutenant mounted: *Provided, however,* that whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of master of the sword and instructor of military gymnastics and physical culture the said office shall cease and determine, and the duties thereunto pertaining shall thereafter be performed by an officer of the line of the Army to be selected for that purpose by the Secretary of War."

So as to make the clause read:

For pay of the master of the sword, \$1,600; and section 1338 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1338. The master of the sword shall hereafter act as the instructor of military gymnastics," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "and eighty" and insert "four hundred," and, in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Section 1278 of the Revised Statutes and sections 2 and 3 of the act approved March 3, 1877 (19 Statutes at Large, page 380), are hereby repealed, and section 1111 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1111. The Military Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one teacher of music, who shall be the leader of the band, and of 40 enlisted musicians. The teacher of music shall have the relative rank and shall receive the pay, allowances, and emoluments of a second lieutenant dismounted; and of the enlisted musicians of the band 12 shall each receive \$34 per month, 12 shall each receive \$25 per month, and the remaining 16 shall each receive \$17 per month; and each of the aforesaid enlisted men shall also be entitled to the clothing, fuel, rations, and other allowances of musicians of cavalry; and the said teacher of music and the enlisted musicians of the band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are, or may hereafter become, applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Army."

So as to make the clause read:

For pay of one teacher of music, \$1,400; section 1278 of the Revised Statutes and sections 2 and 3 of the act approved March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. L., page 380), are hereby repealed, and section 1111 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows, etc.

Mr. SEWELL. I move, in line 17, page 10, after the word "dollars," to insert the word "and;" so as to read "and section 1278," etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to amend the amendment further by striking out, in line 2, page 11, the words "have the relative rank and shall;" in line 3, after the word "pay," to add the word "and," and in the same line to strike out the words "and emoluments."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 9, to increase the appropriation for pay of keeper of post cemetery from \$700 to \$900. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, before the word "hundred," to insert "eight;" so as to make the clause read:

In all, to civilians employed at Military Academy, \$31,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous items and incidental expenses," on page 22, after line 2, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That all technical and scientific supplies for the departments of instruction of the Military Academy shall be purchased by contracts or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may deem best.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 5, to insert:

For a sea wall at river front, \$3,130.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for buildings and grounds from \$200,043 to \$208,173.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 19, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 2. That the senior major-general commanding the Army shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant-general, and his personal staff shall have the rank, pay, and allowances authorized for the staff of a lieutenant-general.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 24, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That the Adjutant-General of the Army shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major-general in the Army of the United States, and on his retirement shall receive the retired pay of that rank: *Provided,* That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Adjutant-General on the expiration of the service of the present incumbent the Adjutant-General shall thereafter have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 6, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 4. That the corps of cadets shall consist of 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, and 50 from

the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 50 cadets appointed from the United States at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, or of the States, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

Mr. PROCTOR. I submit an amendment in lieu of section 4, which has just been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A committee amendment?

Mr. PROCTOR. No, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont offers an amendment as a substitute for section 4, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the corps of cadets shall consist of 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, 2 from each State at large, and 30 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 30 cadets appointed from the United States at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, or of the States, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is identical with the provision which was passed by the Senate in the reorganization bill some three weeks since. It provides for 90 additional cadets—2 from each State at large, and it adds 10 to—

Mr. COCKRELL. By whom are they appointed from each State?

Mr. PROCTOR. They are all appointed by the President.

Mr. HALE. They are Senatorial appointments, of course.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am trying to get at the actual facts. They are all appointed nominally by the President, but it is simply giving each Senator an appointment.

Mr. PROCTOR. I presume they will be appointed on the recommendation of Senators.

Mr. HALE. Does the committee report this provision?

Mr. COCKRELL. No; it was not put by the committee on this bill, and I shall make a point of order against it at the proper time.

Mr. SEWELL. I will state that the committee did report it on another bill, after full discussion, and when we came to put it on this bill, knowing that the other bill would not pass at the present session, the committee declined to report it. It authorized me to report 50, which would be an addition of 30 to the President's appointees.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator insists on this amendment, I shall make a point of order against the whole section.

Mr. COCKRELL. And I hope the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. SEWELL. I trust the Senator from Vermont will not insist on the amendment under the circumstances.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, if I may be allowed to say a word, I hope if we legislate on this subject at all we will provide not that the President shall appoint 50, as the committee amendment provides, but that there shall be the same provision that was in the Army appropriation bill, which contemplated two from each State as I understood it. I think that would secure a distribution of the cadets.

Mr. SEWELL. It was in the organization bill, which has not passed the House, and is not likely to pass at this session.

Mr. HALE. I shall be constrained then to make the point of order.

Mr. FORAKER. There is no parliamentary objection I hope to putting it in the same form here that we had it in the Army organization bill.

Mr. SEWELL. If the Senator from Maine is going to make a point of order we had better not try to put it in.

Mr. FORAKER. I would rather have the point of order made than to have 50 appointed by the President in the way provided here.

Mr. SEWELL. It is absolutely essential that we shall have some increase in the number of cadets at West Point. We have room for them there, and we have places for them in the Army which we can not otherwise fill. I wish to read a statement in relation to the matter.

There are at present 2 vacancies in the Engineer Corps, 27 in the cavalry, 17 in the artillery, 74 in the infantry, making a total of 120. The graduating class numbers 54 cadets. Examining boards have been ordered in every department of the Army, so that enlisted men entitled to compete for promotion shall be examined June 1. It is not known how many this will produce, but it is not expected to provide anything like the number required.

The remainder will be drawn from civil life. The provision in the bill which recently passed the Senate for increasing the artillery and which will probably be passed again early in the next session creates at once 38 vacancies if 20 per cent of the increase takes place the first year. This would be repeated each succeeding year until the total number are appointed.

Taken in connection with the other vacancies arising from retirements, deaths, and resignations, the present corps of cadets will not be able to furnish a sufficient number of graduates to fill the engineers, ordnance, and artillery—

Leaving the question of infantry and cavalry entirely out, and they form the largest body of the Army.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, my only purpose in proposing this amendment was the great need of the Army for more educated officers. I was informed a few days since at the Adjutant-General's

office that there had been 369 appointments to second lieutenantcies in the Regular Army within the last two years. I was hastily running over the different regiments, and I find that in the artillery (and that is the branch which graduates especially seek) there were 42 appointments in that branch, which should be specially scientific, from civil life in the last two years.

In the infantry I did not have time to go through the list, but there is about the average, perhaps some more than that, of from 10 to 13 in each regiment, and of course there are many vacancies. The existing vacancies which can not be filled from West Point should be added to the appointments that are already made, and the appointments have been so great that quite a number of those are already first lieutenants.

In the First Infantry there are 6 first lieutenants; in the Second, 5; in the Third, 3; in the Fourth, 6; in the Fifth, 3; in the Sixth, 3; in the Seventh, 3; in the Eighth, 4; in the Ninth, 2; in the Tenth, 4; in the Eleventh, 3; and in the Twelfth, 5. That was as far as I had time to go in the hurry. There is that number who are already first lieutenants and who have been appointed from civil life within the last two years, since the war broke out. It seems to me very clear that there is an urgent necessity for more educated officers in the Army.

I do not wish for patronage; I should give it to an examining competitive committee; but I think there is excellent reason for favoring this method by States rather than by the President at large, for this reason: It distributes them all over the country. The common custom is for Congressmen to appoint them by competitive examination, which the appointments at large could not well be. It seems to me it is a better system, and the need of more is certainly very evident.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Vermont has stated what I want to emphasize. I do not wish any patronage; I do not wish any responsibility with respect to these appointments; but I recognize, as the committee has evidently recognized, that there is an urgent necessity for increasing the number of educated officers for the Army. I think the number ought to be increased. I do not think the increase, in view of all the circumstances, provided by the amendment now offered by the Senator from Vermont too large; and I think it much better to adopt a provision that looks to the distribution of these cadets all over the country than to put it in the way that is proposed now, which might not secure that distribution.

I am as heartily in favor of increasing the number of officers as the Senator is. I think the number ought to be increased beyond what the committee amendment provides. I do not think the increase provided by the Senator from Vermont is more than it should be. I think the distribution is highly important, not in the sense of giving patronage, for I do not think anybody would care for that; everybody certainly would be glad to be rid of it; but as a matter of securing equity and justice for all the States in this recognition with respect to the Army.

Mr. HALE. I do not think the figures which the Senator from Vermont has given showing appointments from civil life to the Army show that things are going wrong. We are in conditions where we by a kind of necessity have largely increased the Regular Army. Where it was twenty and odd thousand it is likely to be 100,000, and it has got to be built up from the ranks of the people. That there have been within the last two or three years 340 civilian appointments, selected carefully as they have been, is to me a merit. It helps in a degree to reconcile me to the increase of the Army. I do not believe in going on and increasing West Point to a point commensurate with the increase of the Regular Army.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I wish to inform the Senator that the Regular Army has only been increased a trifle over 2,000 men since I have been in Washington.

Mr. HALE. Oh, well; the Senator, of course, understands that, as all of us do. I should like to keep the Regular Army down to 25,000 men. I have no hope of doing that.

Mr. PROCTOR. These appointments are in the Regular Army of 42 regiments.

Mr. HALE. It can not be done. An increase of the Regular Army is a part of the events we are living in. I shall join with anybody to keep it down, so far as we can; but if it is to be increased—and it is to be; there is no doubt about that—I am in favor of these civilian appointments.

Now, the committee that has this matter in charge has not reported in favor of Senatorial cadets. It has reported a system changing the law absolutely—new legislation, providing for the Presidential appointment of 50. I am willing to concede that. I am willing to take the judgment of the committee. But now another change in the existing law is proposed, not from the committee, but by the Senator from Vermont individually. Not content with the action of the committee of which he is a mem-

ber, he seeks to obtrude on the Senate this feature of Senatorial appointments.

If the Senator insists upon that, or if any Senator insists upon it, I shall make the point of order. There is no doubt, I take it, about the section itself to which this amendment is moved. I am not in favor of Senatorial cadets. I do not want Senators to have anything to do with them.

The Senator from Ohio says he does not want the patronage. He can not help it. He will be beset; I know what Ohio is. It is a modest State, but there are men in Ohio who want office; there are men in Ohio who want cadet appointments; there are men in Ohio who will turn up unexpectedly.

Mr. FORAKER. Ohio is like Maine in that respect.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly. The Senator will find to his disappointment he will be beset.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, I have no doubt I will have to meet applications of that kind, and I am willing to do it as a matter of duty, not as a matter of preference or choice.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is a busy man, doing a great deal of valuable work, and I do not want his time taken up in that way.

Mr. FORAKER. It does not take a man very long to make a choice when the applicant comes from Ohio.

Mr. HALE. I do not want either him or any Senator to be bedeviled by Senatorial appointments. I simply say that I am willing to take the section and I will not make the point of order on it; but if it is sought to be extended, as the committee has not extended it, so as to embrace this feature of Senatorial cadets, I shall make the point of order that it is general legislation.

Mr. PROCTOR. As I said, it is only the urgent need of the Army for more educated officers. The last regiment that I looked at here is the Twelfth Infantry, which has not a single graduate among the second lieutenants and there is a small number among the first lieutenants. Very soon they will be without a solitary educated officer in the higher ranks.

Mr. HALE. Why did not the committee then report this proposition?

Mr. PROCTOR. The committee did report exactly this amendment on the organization bill, and the Senate passed it. I do not know of any stronger indorsement.

Mr. HALE. Why did not the committee report it on this bill?

Mr. PROCTOR. I can not say. I was out of town when the committee met. I know that a strong portion of the committee favored it.

Mr. SEWELL. I will say that I tried to have it reported, but the argument on the other side was that if we did not pass the Army increase bill we could well wait for an increase of cadets until next winter. Therefore I gave way, with an increase for the present from twenty to fifty, and agreed to leave out the other feature. I do not want the point of order made against it, because we want to have what is provided in the bill any way.

Mr. HALE. The point of order will not be made if the provision is left alone, but if individual members seek to come in and extend the scope of the provision the point of order will certainly be made. It does not rest with me.

Mr. SEWELL. Under those circumstances, I wish the Senator from Vermont would withdraw his amendment. Does the Senator desire to press his amendment?

Mr. HAWLEY. If he does it may kill the whole section.

Mr. FORAKER. The inquiry is not addressed to me, I trust, although the Senator is looking at me as he makes the inquiry.

Mr. PROCTOR. I would be pleased to have the Senator from Ohio answer the inquiry.

Mr. FORAKER. I would simply say that I would not be coerced about it. I do not like the attitude of the Senator from Maine altogether. Of course, it is his privilege to make the point of order or not make it. I do not mean to use the word in any offensive sense. But the Senator says, "Unless you accept a certain number I will make the point of order," which he can make against this number just as well.

Mr. HALE. I do not say "unless the Senate consents to a certain number." I have not selected the number; the committee has. I find a provision in the bill and I am willing to take it, but I am not willing that it should be extended. I did not select the number.

Mr. FORAKER. It is true the Senator did not, but he says unless we accept the number the committee have reported. Now, the committee made a former report in connection with another bill, and the report they then made was for the larger number provided for by the amendment now offered by the Senator from Vermont. It certainly is conceded here—the committee before it reported to the Senate so voted, and the letter just read by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] shows the truth of it—that the Army needs all the educated officers provided for by the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. I think that is the provision that ought to be adopted, and I hope the Senator from Maine will not press a point of order and will not tell us that unless we yield to the view he entertains, he will make a point of

order and make it impossible for us to legislate on the subject at all; for if the point of order is made in the one case, it may be made in the other, and we will have then to resort to original legislation providing just what the Senate wants or we will not have anything.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know whether the point of order has been made or not, but this is a bill providing for the pay and education of cadets. It seems to me that it is strictly in order on the bill making the appropriation for cadets to increase or diminish the number. The whole bill is for them. It is a change of existing law, it is true, but as the Chair pointed out the other day, that is the rule of the House, not of the Senate. The rule of the Senate is general legislation. Certainly if there is anything appropriate to a bill for the West Point Academy, it is an amendment relating to the number of cadets to be educated and paid for.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I make the point of order, or shall make it, that it is general legislation. If there was not a general law on the general statutes fixing the number of cadets, my point of order would be good for nothing. It is just as good a point of order as it would be if the committee should come in when the law declares that the Regular Army shall consist of 25,000 men and report an amendment making it 100,000 men. Would there be any doubt that that was general legislation? Is not the size of the Army general legislation? Is not the number of cadets already fixed by law general legislation? It is not like a matter of a naval appropriation, where there is no law fixing the number of ships, but the statute fixing the number of cadets—it is just as clearly general legislation as any general provision of law that there is on the statute book. I make the point of order, if I am constrained to make it by the Senator from Vermont, that it is general legislation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we have changed the numbers of the Army on appropriation bills. We have changed the numbers of the Navy on appropriation bills. The Navy is fixed by an appropriation bill just as much as by any other law. An appropriation bill itself is a law. If one appropriation bill fixes a navy to be 20,000 men, that is the law fixing the number of the Navy, and the next appropriation bill amends it; and we have amended the Army in the same way.

Mr. HALE. The point of order has been raised; and we have never on the Army appropriation bill raised the numbers of the Regular Army that are fixed by law.

Mr. SEWELL. But we have in the case of West Point. We have changed everything there by an appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. Because nobody has objected.

Mr. SEWELL. We have not had general legislation there for years.

Mr. HALE. It was done because nobody objected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Some of us have been taught that we never have general legislation on appropriation bills, and so the point of order was not made.

Mr. SEWELL. The West Point Academy bill has been unique in character. It has all been done by the appropriation bills.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Vermont insists on his amendment I must make the point of order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to add to the point of order another item or objection. This is a clause proposed to an appropriation bill that will increase necessarily the expenditures, and it has not been estimated for by the head of any Department or reported by any committee.

Mr. HALE. Is that true?

Mr. COCKRELL (reading):

And no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a new item of appropriation.

As a matter of course, necessarily if we have additional cadets we have got to have an additional appropriation.

Mr. HALE. Has not this been estimated for by the Department?

Mr. COCKRELL. It has not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What was the Senator reading from?

Mr. COCKRELL. I was reading from Rule XVI.

Mr. FORAKER. It has been reported by the committee and it has been adopted once by the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not on an appropriation bill. That was independent legislation.

Mr. PROCTOR. It has been recommended by the Secretary of War and acted upon by the entire Military Committee, without objection, and passed the Senate without a division.

Mr. HALE. Has it passed the other House?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; it is still pending in the committee in the House, not having been reported to the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not understand the Senator from Vermont to say that the Committee on Military Affairs had recommended this as an amendment to this appropriation bill.

Mr. FORAKER. No; nobody has said that, but it is contended that it is not necessary that an amendment shall be reported as an amendment to a particular bill. The purpose of the rule, as some of us at least understand it, is to secure a consideration by a committee of a certain proposition—to wit, the proposition involved in the amendment—and that proposition has been considered in the committee and reported favorably to the Senate, and it has passed the Senate by a unanimous vote.

Mr. HALE. That does not make it general legislation.

Mr. FORAKER. I am not talking as to that point now. I am talking as to the question of the amendment having been considered by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not see any force in the proposition of the Senator from Missouri. Clause 2 of Rule XVI reads:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That amendment, which was reported from the committee, has met all those propositions, because the Committee on Military Affairs is now a committee on appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That applies to the committee's amendment, but not to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. I was speaking solely of the amendment of the committee, which I hold to be in order.

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly, it is competent for any Senator to move to amend a committee amendment. The committee propose an amendment, and the Senator from Vermont moves to amend that amendment by substituting another provision for the amendment. Surely that is in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is an independent proposition, not reported from any committee, and amenable to the objection that it is general legislation and contrary to the provisions of the rule.

Mr. FORAKER. In answer to that, I desire to say that it has been reported by a committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. But not as an amendment to this bill. The Military Committee never recommended this amendment to go on this bill.

Mr. HALE. The point has not been reached yet. Even if the amendment is in order, I do not think it is general legislation; but the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is not in order, because it increases an amendment already reported. That is specifically provided for in the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the point of order been made against the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir; I make the point of order against it.

Mr. HALE. I made the point of order against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to offer an amendment, in section 4, on page 32, line 9, after the word "from," where it occurs the second time, to insert the words "the several States of;" in line 10, after the word "States," to strike out "at large;" and in the same line, after the word "President," to insert "on selection and recommendation of the Senators of the respective States."

That does not increase the number, and it does not increase the appropriation to carry out the provisions of this act, but puts the selection of these cadets in the hands of the Senators of the several States. Under this amendment as it now stands the President of the United States can take every one of these 50 persons from the District of Columbia or from any State or Territory; he can take them all from Massachusetts, if he wants to, or all from Rhode Island, if he wants to, and ignore every other foot of territory in the United States.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me ask the Senator if he would provide any method of distributing them?

Mr. ALLEN. I would.

Mr. HAWLEY. You can not distribute 50 among 90 very well.

Mr. ALLEN. The appointments can be divided properly, and even better in that case than they are now.

The real animus of this amendment is to establish an aristocracy in the Regular Army. That is its purpose. The purpose of this amendment is to permit the sons of officers in the Regular Army to succeed their fathers in the Army by appointment through the agency of the President. That has been the tendency of affairs heretofore; and, indeed, that has gone so far that less than three years ago an officer of the Regular Army, in this city, said that he thought the time had come when the rank held by the father in the Regular Army ought to become hereditary in this country and pass to the son by virtue of that fact.

Mr. SEWELL. Do I understand the Senator to say that, the father holding the rank, it would not be proper to appoint the son if the father had been killed in battle?

Mr. ALLEN. If the son is competent and fitted for it, all right.

Mr. SEWELL. Appointments in the Army and the Navy have always been given to the President, but they are limited in their number and are generally given as a reward for gallantry in the field or for distinguished service.

Mr. ALLEN. The son has no right to receive an appointment on account of his father.

Mr. SEWELL. These appointments are made in this manner because the sons of officers can not otherwise secure an appointment by reason of not having any Congressional district and because of their living in the Army. Therefore it is perfectly proper that the President should have the right to reward the sons of distinguished and gallant officers.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New Jersey reveals exactly what I said just now, that this is true as to the sons of officers regardless of the question of their fitness. What is the use of taking a pine stick and appointing him in the Army or to any other place simply because his father was an officer of the Army?

Mr. SEWELL. You might say the same as to appointments from civil life. It is supposed the son of a captain in the Navy or the son of a colonel in the Army is likely to be just as good as any other boy in the country.

Mr. ALLEN. You propose to shut out by this amendment every worthy and competent boy in the United States who does not derive his parentage from an officer in the Army or in the Navy.

Mr. SEWELL. I do not. I was in favor of giving 90 appointments to the States at large. I voted for it, and we reported a bill for it; but it has not passed the House. When we came to go over the question again, a majority of the Senate committee was opposed to it on the ground of not having passed the artillery bill, which would require more cadets than any other branch of the Army, and that we had better wait until next winter. I shall be in favor of it next winter on the general reorganization bill.

Mr. ALLEN. As to men who have risen to eminent distinction in the Army and Navy of the United States, I do not know of a single instance where they were the sons of eminent men, including my distinguished friend in charge of this bill. I call upon him or any other Senator to point to an instance in all the history of this great Republic of ours—there may be a single, isolated instance—where the son of a man who had become eminent in the Army or in the Navy ever himself became eminent or even efficient.

Mr. SEWELL. I deny that proposition.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to give the Senator one case. He says there may be a solitary instance. I presume there are a great many cases. I instance the case in the Navy of the Selfridges. Admiral Selfridge, who is now at the age of 95 years, is on the retired list, and his son, who is also an admiral, is on the retired list. There are these two Selfridges on the retired list and a son in the service, all splendid officers.

Does not the Senator believe that the sons of Army and Navy officers are just as likely to be efficient and to make good officers in the Army and Navy as the sons of civilians?

Mr. LODGE. There is another most conspicuous instance of Admiral Porter, whose father was Commodore Porter in the war of 1812.

Mr. ALLEN. From Paul Jones down to Dewey, Farragut, Perry, and all of them, and there is not a single instance where the father was eminent in military or naval life. So you may take our Army from George Washington to the present distinguished Commander in Chief, and there is not a single instance in which the father was an eminent man in military life—not one. The reverse is true. They were all the sons of humble men who had no distinction in military life at all. Now you propose to follow out this namby-pamby idea that the Regular Army and the Navy must be pandered to and the son appointed by virtue of his birth, and not in consequence of his merit; he must pass into the ranks occupied by his father, when all the meritorious boys all over this country, having natural military and naval instincts and aptitude, are to be denied by this provision.

Mr. CHANDLER. What makes the Senator say that these appointments are to be made from the sons of Army and Navy officers?

Mr. ALLEN. Because I know that is the way it has been done heretofore. That is the animus or purpose of this amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Could not Mr. Bryan be trusted to do justice by the sons of the prairies of Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not propose to engage in any discussion with the Senator from New Hampshire about Mr. Bryan. I think the Senator belittles himself, and every other Senator on that side of the Chamber belittles himself, when, on every pretext, specious as it is, he undertakes to force the name of Mr. Bryan into the discussion here in this Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. I withdraw Mr. Bryan.

Mr. ALLEN. I have spoken of the President of the United States with respect—

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; you may have two words.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator argues as if there was something in the law to compel the President of the United States to give these appointments to the sons of Army and Navy officers. The President does it in certain cases, because the Army and Navy officers generally are not able to get their sons in from the Congressional districts; but there is no law to that effect.

Mr. ALLEN. Why should they?

Mr. CHANDLER. And any President ought to be trusted to make these selections. The Senator seems to be creating the impression that the law requires this to be done.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not create any impression of that kind.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will merely say that in the absence of law the custom is precisely as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] states it; and I have no doubt that if the number to be appointed by the President is increased, they will be appointed from the sons of distinguished military and naval officers.

Mr. ALLEN. There is not the slightest doubt about it. That is the purpose. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] admits it; and there is no controversy about it.

I want to say once for all that this constant running the name of Mr. Bryan into discussion here belittles Senators who do it. Mr. Bryan is a private citizen of the United States; he is denied the privileges of this floor; he is not here to answer for himself. If he were, Senators would hesitate a little, perhaps, more than they now do, in speaking his name as they do.

I am not the political friend of the President of the United States. He does not believe in the policy in which I believe. I will do everything in my power to defeat him at the polls this fall, and will do it honestly and conscientiously; and yet, Mr. President, I have never mentioned in this Chamber the name of the distinguished gentleman who occupies the White House, except in the most kindly terms, and I would not suffer myself to do it. I have never brought his name into a discussion in this Chamber, and I shall not do so now. I trust that self-respect and the ordinary decencies and proprieties and amenities of life will induce Senators upon the other side of the Chamber to refrain from throwing Mr. Bryan's name into discussion here as if they were kicking a football into the arena.

The Senator from New Hampshire who was last on his feet [Mr. GALLINGER], with his usual candor and his usual truthfulness, admits that the purpose of this amendment is to put this power into the hands of the President of the United States; I care not who he may be. The present occupant of the White House is not like She, who must be obeyed, as written by Haggard; he can not live two thousand years; he can not always be President of the United States. In the course of time that distinguished gentleman will retire to private life and another man will be President of the United States. We can not take it for granted that this provision will not be abused at some time if it becomes a permanent law of the United States.

I ask again, Why do you desire to build up an aristocracy in the Navy or the Army of the United States?

Are not thousands and millions of poor boys scattered through the workshops and farms of this country entitled as much to the consideration of Congress, and as much entitled to admission to the Military and Naval Academies, if they show themselves competent, as the boys who simply have the fortune, or the misfortune, whichever it may be, of being the sons of men who have occupied or who do occupy official position in these branches of the public service? Why should the little boy raised on the farm, with good health and good education, with military aptitudes or naval aptitudes, possessing all the qualifications that a boy could possess for one of these lines of service, be denied it because he is the son of a peasant, perhaps, and the son of some man who is loaded from head to foot with gold lace, by reason of that fact, be permitted to take his place?

We have reached a period, Mr. President, when it is but a step, and a short one, from modern republicanism to a crown; and this is one of the steps that is being taken.

Mr. FORAKER. I move to amend the amendment proposed by the committee by inserting, on page 32, in section 4, line 10, after the words "at large," the following:

Not more than two of whom shall be appointed from the same State.

So that the sentence will read:

That the corps of cadets shall consist of one from each Congressional district, one from each Territory, one from the District of Columbia, and fifty from the United States at large, not more than two of whom shall be appointed from the same State.

Mr. SEWELL. I will accept that suggestion.

Mr. FORAKER. The purpose of that amendment is to secure the distribution of these appointments all over the country.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest to the Senator to say "not more than two of whom shall be appointed from any State, Territory, or District."

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will observe the language of the section, it already provides that there shall be "one from each

Territory, one from the District of Columbia, and fifty from the United States at large."

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator accept an amendment that these appointments shall be made upon the recommendation of the Senators from the States?

Mr. FORAKER. I do not care for that. That would look as though we were trying to get the appointments into our hands. I do not care for that, and I do not want to bother with it. What I am trying to do is to secure an equitable distribution of these appointments.

Mr. ALLEN. We do that as respects the others.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all.

Mr. FORAKER. That is another matter altogether.

Mr. ALLEN. Would not the same practice be followed in the selection of these cadets?

Mr. SEWELL. Allow me to say that I will accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio, provided that it does not include the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] about somebody recommending the appointments to the President.

Mr. ALLEN. I simply want to have a fair understanding about this matter. I am not going to object to this capriciously; but if this amendment of the Senator from Ohio is accepted and becomes the law, is it the understanding of the committee that the same rule will be followed, so far as it can be, in the selection of these fifty cadets, that is followed in the selection of those from the Congressional districts?

Mr. FORAKER. I have no doubt it would be, but I am not concerned about that.

Mr. COCKRELL. I protest against any understanding of that kind. The Constitution of our country vests in the President the sole appointing power. It is not right that the Senate should undertake to encroach upon the appointing power by grabbing at a little patronage for each Senator, so as to have a cadet at West Point. I think it is small business for the Senate to engage in, seeking to have the privilege of designating some one to attend the West Point Academy.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope the Senator from Missouri does not apply any of that remark to me.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not apply it to anybody. I say the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator must imagine that there is a necessity for saying it.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a necessity because of this proposition.

Mr. FORAKER. I have said from the beginning that I do not want to have anything to do with these appointments, except only as it may be necessary to discharge a responsible duty; but I do think that the number of cadets to be educated at West Point ought to be increased, and I do think that they ought to be equitably distributed, when it comes to the making of the appointments, over the whole country. That is the only purpose I have in view. I shall be glad to turn over to somebody else the selection of the appointments coming to Ohio.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is claimed that there is a great demand for additional cadets and that three or four hundred junior officers have been appointed. What harm has been done? Whence did they come? From the walks of civil life.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, I would say, in answer to the inquiry he has made as to what harm has come from the appointments, that I am not on the Military Committee and do not have as accurate information as the members of that committee probably have; but it has come to me that a great number of the appointees from civil life, especially in the artillery corps, have been compelled—or rather it has been found necessary, I will say, to send them to technical schools to be educated before they could satisfactorily discharge the duties of officers.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is done with the graduates of West Point.

Mr. FORAKER. It is not, except only as they are given a post-graduate course, which is provided for. I believe in the education that the cadets receive at West Point. I believe it is an efficient education. I believe they turn out good officers there. I do not believe, however, that they there learn everything necessary to a thorough understanding of the art of war, and therefore I believe in the propriety of providing the post-graduate course, to which the Senator from Missouri must have reference; but I do not believe that we ought to appoint from civil life officers to take charge of these guns, that are of fine, delicate, and difficult mechanism, and then find it necessary to send them off to be educated before they can discharge the duties of officers. I think it is our duty here and now to provide for a proper education of the men who are to command the soldiers of the Republic.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Ohio yield to me now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] is recognized.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to get permission of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not if the Senator wishes to make another speech. He can make that after I get through.

Mr. FORAKER. I wanted to ask the Senator a question. I had the floor and was addressing the Senate when the Senator interrupted me. I did not yield the floor to him.

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not so understand it; but, however, I ask if I may proceed now?

Mr. FORAKER. I have nothing to do with your privileges in the Senate, and I do not appreciate the inquiry. I think it is entirely unnecessary and gratuitous.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I do not believe there is any urgent necessity just at this time that there should be such an enormous increase in the appointments at West Point. What have we to-day? We have over 100,000 men, and we have some of the brightest and most reliable young men in this whole nation now in the ranks of the Army as sergeants and as first lieutenants. They are in the volunteer service, which expires on the 1st of July, 1901. When that time comes they will want appointments in the Army; they will have the practical education for it, and an experience that is worth more than an education at West Point. They will be expecting appointments.

Then what will your appointments of cadets do to supply deficiencies? It will take four years before one of them can be graduated; and if he is appointed now it will be five years before he can go out as a graduate from West Point. So there is no pressing necessity now for this amendment, and I do not believe that under the Constitution and our system of government the Senate ought to attempt to control these appointments. I believe that belongs to the appointing power. We do not control the appointments of the cadets from the Congressional districts. The President appoints them. It is simply a matter of discretion with him as to whether he appoints the cadet who is recommended by the Representative of a particular district or not. There is no law requiring him to do it. I do not know what the President would do if this amendment were adopted, whether he would consult Senators or not. I do not think he ought to do so. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to be consulted in such a case as that. I believe it is better that no such consultation should be had, and I would oppose anything that would be recognized and could be presented to the President as the understanding of the Senate that we were to name these appointees.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there would have been no friction about this matter, and the bill would have passed an hour ago just as the committee intrusted with it reported it; but there are certain Senators here who do not believe in the feature of Senatorial cadets. They think it is unseemly, whether it is done directly or in the form of an amendment, that the Senate should scramble for patronage. We have wasted an hour here simply because the committee amendments reported by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] who has charge of the bill were not let alone. I did not touch them; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] did not touch them; the Senator from New Jersey in charge of the bill did not touch them.

We were willing to take the action of the committee as conservative action, which it is, of course, to a certain extent; and if it had not been interfered with and the committee amendments sought to be changed, there would have been no discussion and no friction. I must object, for one, whether voted down or not, against the spectacle of the Senate seeming to scramble for the appointment of a cadet or two cadets for each Senator. It is not seemly. We ought to acquiesce in the action of the Senate committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Who is scrambling for patronage here?

Mr. HALE. Any man, I do not care in what form he puts it, who wants to take away these appointments from the President and provide for two cadets at large from each State or one from each State, knows what it means is that they shall be Senatorial appointments.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the Senator from Maine is doing himself an injustice by undertaking to put our view of this matter upon some selfish claim of patronage. I know, so far as I am concerned, I would not appoint one of these fellows if I had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HALE. The Senator would have to do so.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not a worshiper of West Point, as the Senator from Maine is.

Mr. HALE. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont is insisted upon and passes, the Senator will have to appoint cadets.

Mr. ALLEN. I would not do so.

Mr. HALE. If the President should consult the Senator about the matter, he could not help it.

Mr. ALLEN. I would not do so.

Mr. HALE. There would be so many applications, I want to say to the Senator, that he would not be able to avoid it.

Mr. ALLEN. The President of the United States is not big enough to compel me to do what I do not want to do.

Mr. HALE. If the bill is insisted upon just as it was reported, there will not be a word against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

Mr. FORAKER. I want to say a word in answer to the remarks just made by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator allow the amendment to be first stated?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, in section 4, line 10, after the words "at large," it is proposed to insert "not more than two of whom shall be appointed from the same State."

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know exactly what the purpose of the Senator from Maine was in attributing to Senators motives which they have disclaimed. Certainly it is no offense for a Senator to differ with another Senator as to a proposition that comes before this body for consideration, and it ought not to be any offense for Senators to dissent to a proposition emanating from a committee. We are all here, I take it, to act upon our sense of responsibility and our sense of duty; and when Senators impute to others an improper motive or unworthy motive, as that we are scrambling for patronage, I can only say that such a thought could originate only with a man who is capable of doing it himself. I have no such purpose. I have had no such thought. I do not want to send anybody to West Point. I have no candidates applying to me, and I have nobody I want to favor.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to ask—

Mr. FORAKER. And I repudiate and resent the idea that we can not be allowed to express our own opinions here without being made the subject of remarks of that character.

Mr. HALE. Oh, Mr. President, my remarks have not been severe. I could have made them a great deal more severe.

Mr. PROCTOR. Suppose you try it?

Mr. HALE. I want to ask the Senator what reason he has for this? If the President in his discretion should choose to appoint more than two of these from one State, what reason is there why he should not do so?

Mr. FORAKER. I have stated it several times.

Mr. HALE. I have not heard the Senator.

Mr. FORAKER. It was urged here, in opposition to the amendment proposed by the committee, that an undue number might be taken from a particular State. It occurred to me—I may be in error about it, but certainly I am entitled to my opinion and to present it to the Senate—that it would be better to have these appointments distributed over the whole of the 45 States of the Union, and therefore it seemed to me that it would be an appropriate amendment to submit, and I submitted it in good faith.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FORAKER. It was to avoid the taking of an undue number from any particular State, and to distribute them over all the States. It can not be possible that you can not find at least one man in each of the forty-five States who would make a competent and worthy cadet at West Point. I believe in giving every State an opportunity.

Mr. HALE. Is not the President likely to do that?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say to the Senator, no.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know whether the President is likely to do it or not. He can or can not do it, just as he sees fit; but I do not believe in intrusting it to the President to select from where he pleases, except subject to proper limitations.

I did not think of the matter until it was suggested here, on the floor of the Senate, in this debate. I thought it was a good suggestion. I thought it was one we might with propriety incorporate in this bill, and that we might do it without being charged with having unnecessarily taken an hour of time. I notice that the Senator from Maine, when other people differ with him and take a little time, is always ready to talk about a waste of time and to say it might have been avoided if we had accepted the action of the committee and had adopted his particular views about it.

Mr. HALE. I have not suggested any views. I am in favor—

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Maine stated that we had wasted an hour, which might have been saved if we had accepted the action of the committee, but that Senators had insisted upon differing with the committee and upon differing with the distinguished Senator from Maine. I shall differ with the Senator from Maine when I see fit.

Mr. HALE. I do not think I stated that I thought the time was wasted, but I have a grave feeling that it has been.

Mr. FORAKER. I have not yielded to the Senator, and I have not heard what he said. I will hear him.

Mr. HALE. I am not criticising the Senator from Ohio. He is not a man who unduly uses up the time of the Senate or makes unduly long speeches. But I certainly had a right to feel as I did, particularly when the amendment which arrested the progress of the bill and used the hour that has been well taken, I will say, instead of wasted, clearly meant Senatorial appointments. I had a right to call attention to that, and to say that I did not think it was a seemly thing for the Senate. I did not mean to say that any Senator could not favor that and make a speech for it, but I thought it was an unseemly thing for the Senate to seem to be scrambling for these appointments. That does not cut off the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Vermont, and it was a very proper and a very suitable remark for me to make and I still hold to that opinion.

Mr. FORAKER. I stated at the outset of this debate that I had no such intention and no such desire; but that does not seem to satisfy the Senator from Maine. He wants to go on insisting upon a suggestion as to motive that he knows is offensive to other Senators. I do not think the Senator ought to do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me a moment?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. A while ago there were a hundred or two hundred second lieutenants to be appointed in the Army. I happen to know that a good many Senators who are imputing wrong motives to certain other Senators and talking about Senatorial patronage traveled to the White House quite as often as I did to see that they got some of those appointments.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes. I think a good many Senators here, and some of them speaking in opposition, have been to the White House a good deal oftener than I have been there. I am not troubled about patronage. I am not scrambling for anything, I trust. But I do believe in West Point education for the officers of our Army, and I do believe that we need more educated officers in the Army than this bill provides for. I should like to see the whole number provided, and I am perfectly willing that it may be provided here that Senators shall not recommend at all or have anything to do with it, so far as I am concerned. That is not what I want. I want to see enough officers educated to meet the demands of the Army, and I want to get rid of the condition of things which we witness now of appointees to official positions from civil life being relieved from duty in order that they may go to a school of instruction and become instructed, so that they may command the men whom they have been appointed to command and do the duties they ought to be qualified to do as officers. That is the only purpose I have in view. I think it a commendable purpose, and I insist upon it.

Mr. SEWELL. I hope we may now dispose of the bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I will take only a moment. My disposition would be to answer the Senator from Maine more forcibly, if it were possible, than the Senator from Ohio did, but as it is not in my power, I am glad to leave him to the tender mercies of that Senator. I disclaim any purpose of seeking patronage in proposing this amendment. I considered it perfectly proper and legitimate to propose an amendment identical with that which has been recommended unanimously from the Military Affairs Committee and which passed the Senate, and knowing the urgent need of the Army for more educated officers.

The system of distributing them among the States is in accordance with the policy of the present law. The law, to be sure, gives the appointment of all to the President, but custom has given one to each Representative. The recommendation comes from each Representative. It is merely carrying out the present theory and custom to give two at large. So far as I may have to do with the patronage, the custom in my State, which I should certainly carry out, is to have a competitive examination. I think it is a much better system to distribute these appointments through the different States, and I think we would get better appointments than to have them all at large.

Appointments to cadetships are sought for even more than an appointment to high rank in the Army. There will be hundreds of applications for these positions. Everybody who has no chance to get it from his own State will apply to the President. I for one think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio is a wise one.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, to be shaken aside and to rest under the imputation expressed by the Senator from Maine. It is to be regretted that a Senator can not differ with that Senator or his associates without being classified as a man of sordid purposes and aims. The Senator says that the bill could have passed here long ago if these amendments had not been proposed. What is the bill here for? Is it here to be passed exactly as the committee recommends it, regardless of the wishes of a majority of this Chamber? Are all of us who do not serve upon the Committee on Military Affairs to sit down and fold our hands and witness the passage of this bill literally as reported, without protest and without vote, or is it here

for the purpose of being analyzed by Senators, and for the purpose of being amended if, in their best judgment, its provisions as reported are not right?

The number of Presidential appointees have been increased, I think, some 20 to 30. In the first place, there is no excuse offered for that increase. No man has offered a reason.

Mr. SEWELL. The Senator from Nebraska is mistaken. The number is 20 now.

Mr. ALLEN. I say 20 to 30. No man has offered a reason why the increase should be 150 per cent in these Presidential appointees. As a matter of fact, there is no reason, in my judgment, except that reason which has been disclosed here of providing soft jobs for the sons of officers.

Mr. SEWELL. I do not want the Senator from Nebraska to make such a mistake. I gave the reason for the increase. I gave the Department reasons, that with this increase it would not do for more than one or two branches of the service; that the cavalry and infantry would still be without a cadet next year.

Mr. ALLEN. I am perfectly willing to take the Senator's statement as expressive of his views, and I have no doubt he expresses his views honestly and conscientiously, as he always does intelligently, but the suspicion is upon my mind, and it amounts to a conviction to me, that underlying this provision of the law is the purpose of transferring almost one-half of the membership of West Point into the hands of the sons of officers of the Regular Army. I want to protest against it as un-republican and un-American. It is proposed to build up an aristocracy here that will smell to heaven, so that the man in the moon as he passes over here will have to hold his nose.

Mr. SEWELL. The Senator also knows that the appointees to West Point come from the Representatives of the districts and the Delegates—350 or more.

Mr. ALLEN. The best soldiers this country ever had, or ever will have, are the volunteer soldiers from the different States and Territories. Who made more blunders during the civil war than the graduates of West Point? Who left more gaps in their armies, of two and three hundred yards, a quarter of a mile, so that the enemy might pour through unrestricted, on a dozen battlefields, than the graduates of West Point? Good, fair, intelligent citizens put upon a horse in command of an army would not be guilty of such a blunder. I am not going to call names, but I could stand here and call those names, if it were proper to do so.

I am not an enemy of this academy. I believe in the necessity of educating young men and forming the nucleus for a great army. I believe that yearly a certain number of students should be educated at this academy and the Naval Academy, but I do not believe in educating one man more at the expense of the Government than is necessary to go out in time of war and become an instrument in drilling and educating an army.

No man has ever yet pointed out a reason why the President should have this power except that he desired the power. It is a power that belongs to the people. They have a right, through their representatives, to say who shall represent them in the Military and Naval academies, as they have a right to say who shall represent them in the Executive Mansion and in the branches of Congress and in other branches of the public service. If the Senator from New Jersey will accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio I shall have nothing further to say.

Mr. SEWELL. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey accepts the modified committee amendment by accepting that.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I understand that section 4 is not necessary or essential to the bill. The law as it stands today provides for the number of cadets at West Point and the manner in which they shall be appointed. Therefore this must be general legislation, and I make the point of order against section 4 of the bill that it proposes general legislation and is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the committee which had charge of the West Point appropriation bill were authorized to report such an amendment as this, and that it is not open to the objection that it is general legislation. It is open to the objection, if it were in the House, that it changes existing law.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am opposed to the paragraph largely for the reasons given by the Senator from Nebraska. I have been a member of the Senate about eleven years, and I was for two years a member of the House of Representatives, and no person was ever appointed either to West Point or to the Naval Academy at Annapolis upon my recommendation. I never had or sought any patronage whatever in that direction. Yet I believe that the cadets should be chosen from the different States and from the body of our people. I do not believe we ought to build up in this country a military class. I believe it is contrary to the genius of our institutions and absolutely unnecessary.

The soldiers of a republic should fight only for the defense of their homes and the defense of their country. The soldiers of a

republic should never be enlisted for conquest or for the subjection of any other people in the world. Therefore, the necessity with us for a standing army does not exist, except the skeleton, perhaps, of a standing army or a small body of troops to do the police duty of the country. The volunteers can do all the fighting a republic should ever do. That they can do better fighting than any other class of men in the world is proved by the wonderful exploits of the farmer soldiers of the South African Republic.

If England had outnumbered them but two to one, they would have destroyed England's army before this, and if there was anything left of it driven it into the sea. They have only been overcome by mustering an army of over ten to one. It did not require military training for those men to fight, not only with unparalleled courage, but with great ability and great skill, handling their men as men were never handled before. So I say the history of the world teaches us that it is not necessary that a republic should maintain a standing army; neither is a military education necessary to military success and military fame.

Under this provision we add 50 men each year to the cadets at West Point, selected by the President, and they will be from the military classes.

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator allow me to correct him? We do not add 50 every year, but 50 every four years.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Well, 50 every four years.

Mr. SEWELL. Let me say that that is only twelve and a half a year, and not a half of those graduate—only about 6 a year. So it adds very few officers to the Army.

Mr. PETTIGREW. We give this power of appointment to the President, and they will be selected from the military classes. I object to building up a military class in this country. Therefore I am opposed to increasing the number of men the President shall select. I am not opposed to it because I want any patronage. I am not opposed to it because I would have the patronage if it were in my reach, for I would leave it to somebody else to bestow.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, what is the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the committee in charge of the bill would allow section 1819 of the Revised Statutes to remain as it is.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me, before we pass to any other matter? There are a few words, now that the amendment I have offered has been adopted, which should be stricken out, in order to make the bill harmonious. I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the fact, now that my amendment has been adopted, that the words, in line 11, "with the exception of the 50 cadets appointed from the United States at large" should be stricken out. The elimination of those words will make it harmonious and consistent. I move that they be stricken out.

Mr. SEWELL. That is quite satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 11, after the word "shall," it is proposed to strike out "with the exception of the 50 cadets appointed from the United States at large."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish the committee would leave out section 5. Cadets now have to be well versed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, to have a knowledge of the elements of English grammar, descriptive geography, particularly that of the United States, and the history of the United States. That is a well-worded statute, and to substitute for it a discretionary examination by the Secretary of War it seems to me is no improvement. I wish the committee would omit that section, unless they have some very good reason for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what section does the Senator from New Hampshire speak?

Mr. CHANDLER. Section 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 4 has not been agreed to. The question is on agreeing to section 4 as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Did I understand the Chair to put the question on agreeing to section 4?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On section 4.

Mr. BACON. On the question of the adoption of the amendment as amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As amended.

Mr. BACON. I hope we may have a vote on that, but before a vote is taken I desire to say a word. Am I in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will regard it as an open question.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not desire to take any part in the discussion of the abstract question of the propriety of the appointment of these additional cadets or of the particular manner in which they shall be appointed. In the course of a short

time, after the conclusion of the term of service now running to a close, the soldiers in the Philippine Islands will return to this country. I think there is a great deal in the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri with respect to the very large number of young men who are now actively engaged in military service in the Philippine Islands. No one will question the fact that the schooling which they are now receiving will eminently qualify them to fill the positions of lieutenants in the Regular Army when their term of service shall expire. They are coming home next summer, and a very large proportion of them will desire to remain in the Army.

A very large proportion of those who are now holding commissions, as well as those who are noncommissioned officers, will naturally think that they should be preferred when the Government comes to increase the number of second lieutenants in the Army. They will be applicants for the positions. They have won the right to the consideration of the Government in the selection of those who shall be appointed to second lieutenantcies.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. KYLE. Does the Senator think that such appointees should be required to stand an examination?

Mr. BACON. That is a matter to be determined hereafter when we come to deal directly with it.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that before these cadets can be available for service four or five years will elapse.

Mr. BACON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HARRIS. And in the meantime these lieutenants now in the service will have ample opportunities to be provided for without any interference.

Mr. BACON. That may be, but at the same time the number of those who will be seeking positions in the Army will be very large. I think we can very safely leave this until we come next winter to the question, as we undoubtedly will come to it, in respect to what shall be the size of the Army, how many commissioned officers we are going to have, how many lieutenants will be required. I am in favor of so shaping this matter as to give these young men, when they come back from the Philippines, the preference. Let them be appointed lieutenants, and there will be sufficient time, after they are provided for, to make provision for such increase in the number of cadets as may be necessary to supply the needs that may thereafter arise.

As to the question of examination, which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] suggests to me, I have not considered it, and I do not propose to express an opinion on it at this time.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to state—

Mr. BACON. The Senator from South Dakota has asked me to yield, which I have done. After that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KYLE. If the Senator expects to take these young men into the Army as lieutenants, I think his hopes will be disappointed, because not one of them could pass the examination required at the present time.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand that there is any intention to make any provision in this bill with reference to that matter. This is not a proper bill for that; it is a bill which relates to the Military Academy; but we will have before us next winter bills in which it will be proper to make provisions for it. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to say to the Senator that this is a very small increase in the number of cadets. It will not materially affect the number of officers. We did present a bill here, and had it passed through the Senate unanimously, to appoint a hundred and ten. This is an increase of only thirty. I read a paper here from the Adjutant-General's Department, stating that the requirements of the Army next year will be short, leaving out entirely the cavalry and infantry, which are the largest branches of the service.

I have no doubt that even with this little increase, which will not affect us for four years, we will require next year from a hundred to a hundred and fifty young men, to be taken from the Army or from civil life. I have always been a believer in promotion from the ranks. A great many good young men, some of them graduates of colleges, have gone into the Army in the last two years to get commissions, as they are getting them gradually. I believe in that class of material. At the same time there are branches of the service like the engineer, the artillery, the ordnance corps, which require a higher state of technical knowledge than is likely to be acquired in the Army in the ranks, and for those we need an increase of cadets at West Point.

Mr. BACON. I simply desired to give my reasons why I shall vote against the amendment; and I hope we may have a vote upon it.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the amendment pending?

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee amendment.

Mr. SEWELL. The committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. HAWLEY. Section 4?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 4.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 32, after line 15, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 5. That section 1319, chapter 4, Title XIV, of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 1319. Appointees shall be examined under regulations to be framed by the Secretary of War before they shall be admitted to the Academy, and shall be required to be well versed in such subjects as he may from time to time prescribe."

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I think the committee on an appropriation bill ought not to change section 1319 of the Revised Statutes so as to strike out these very sensible requirements for admission to West Point:

Shall be required to be well versed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and to have a knowledge of the elements of English grammar, of descriptive geography, particularly that of the United States, and of the history of the United States—

and put the authority wholly with the Secretary of War to prescribe such requisites for admission as he sees fit. Section 1319 as it stands is a very wholesome section, and I hope the amendment may be withdrawn by the committee.

Mr. SEWELL. I do not see that it makes much difference. It modifies somewhat the requisites for admission, so that the Secretary of War may take advantage of that modification. At the same time it is not of sufficient importance to make any contest over it, and I will agree that section 5 may be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 5 goes out.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 28) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Waters;

A bill (S. 61) granting a pension to George Bunce;

A bill (S. 78) granting a pension to Samuel W. Childs;

A bill (S. 103) granting an increase of pension to Charles Critzer;

A bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Dwight D. Wilber;

A bill (S. 169) granting a pension to George E. Tuttle;

A bill (S. 258) granting an increase of pension to Coryden Bevans;

A bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Rosa L. Couch;

A bill (S. 410) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. Gridley;

A bill (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Fielding L. Rutherford;

A bill (S. 716) granting a pension to Susan Buck;

A bill (S. 756) granting a pension to Lydia F. Wiley;

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Coons;

A bill (S. 847) granting an increase of pension to James B. Logan;

A bill (S. 1207) granting an increase of pension to Levi Chandler;

A bill (S. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Augustus C. Pyle;

A bill (S. 1364) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Blockson;

A bill (S. 1441) granting an increase of pension to James G. Hartzell;

A bill (S. 1460) granting a pension to Charles A. Hutchings;

A bill (S. 1533) granting a pension to David Carroll;

A bill (S. 1548) granting an increase of pension to James Byrne;

A bill (S. 1551) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;

A bill (S. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent;

A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes;

A bill (S. 1569) granting a pension to Phebe E. C. Priestley;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch;

A bill (S. 1608) granting a pension to Eleanor R. Sullivan;

A bill (S. 1734) granting a pension to Mary S. Belding;

A bill (S. 1758) granting an increase of pension to Farnham J. Eastman;

A bill (S. 1776) granting a pension to John Carr;
 A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Shup;
 A bill (S. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Lewis;
 A bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Elvira Hunter;
 A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade;
 A bill (S. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Consolacion Victoria Kirkland;
 A bill (S. 1975) granting an increase of pension to Annie D. M. Wood;
 A bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Flavel H. Van Eaton;
 A bill (S. 2020) granting a pension to Sarah E. Fortier;
 A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to George E. Scott;
 A bill (S. 2142) for the relief of Anna Whitney Tarbell;
 A bill (S. 2203) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor;
 A bill (S. 2215) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce;
 A bill (S. 2276) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland;
 A bill (S. 2280) granting a pension to Horatio N. Cornell;
 A bill (S. 2286) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig;
 A bill (S. 2296) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears;
 A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard;
 A bill (S. 2451) granting a pension to Jennie P. Stover;
 A bill (S. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Daniels;
 A bill (S. 2550) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hobart;
 A bill (S. 2651) granting a pension to Henry Hill;
 A bill (S. 2795) granting an increase of pension to Christina Noll;
 A bill (S. 2900) granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff;
 A bill (S. 2938) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Longmire;
 A bill (S. 2941) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gamble, jr.;
 A bill (S. 2961) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lochard;
 A bill (S. 2962) granting an increase of pension to William Blades;
 A bill (S. 2977) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fletcher;
 A bill (S. 2993) granting an increase of pension to Edward Madden;
 A bill (S. 3047) granting an increase of pension to William Mullevy;
 A bill (S. 3058) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Meylert;
 A bill (S. 3082) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Wolfley;
 A bill (S. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Kate Cadwell;
 A bill (S. 3183) granting a pension to George W. Newell;
 A bill (S. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Mary Yowell;
 A bill (S. 3268) granting an increase of pension to Elisha F. Barton;
 A bill (S. 3277) granting an increase of pension to Solon Cooper;
 A bill (S. 3289) granting a pension to Isabella Underwood;
 A bill (S. 3293) granting an increase of pension to Helen Harlow;
 A bill (S. 3294) granting a pension to Louisa Moulton;
 A bill (S. 3300) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson;
 A bill (S. 3314) granting a pension to Mary I. Bradbury;
 A bill (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Kate B. Warren;
 A bill (S. 3337) granting an increase of pension to Buren R. Sherman;
 A bill (S. 3418) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Adelaide Ball;
 A bill (S. 3467) granting a pension to Hellen Lang;
 A bill (S. 3527) granting a pension to Edwin M. Farnham;
 A bill (S. 3549) granting an increase of pension to William A. Keyes;
 A bill (S. 3634) granting a pension to Mary P. Hunter;
 A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Smith;
 A bill (S. 3708) granting a pension to John H. Harrison;
 A bill (S. 3788) granting an increase of pension to James Williams;
 A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to James Cook;
 A bill (S. 3900) granting a pension to Sarah Clark;
 A bill (S. 4006) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Tucker;
 A bill (S. 4007) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn;

A bill (S. 4040) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Gage;
 A bill (S. 4077) granting a pension to Frances Horton Force;
 A bill (S. 4087) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Mansur;
 A bill (S. 4215) granting a pension to Belle Bean;
 A bill (S. 4421) granting an increase of pension to Abert Brown; and
 A bill (S. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Dyhrenfurth.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I will say to Senators that if Senators, perhaps at some expense of their personal convenience, will stay here for a couple of hours we can pass this bill. It is the last appropriation bill. The members of that committee will then go into conference rooms and be out of the way, and other business of the Senate can come up.

Mr. PETTUS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TELLER and others. Oh, no.

Mr. HALE. I hope not.

Mr. PETTUS. We have had no session for executive business for some time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I appeal to the Senator from Alabama not to interfere with the consideration of this appropriation bill. Let us consider it, and after that the Senate can take up executive business. I am as much in favor of it as the Senator.

Mr. PETTUS. At what time?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Whenever we dispose of this appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. I am very much in favor of getting the appropriation bills out of the way. I have two or three matters on the Calendar—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama withdraw the motion?

Mr. PETTUS. No, sir; I will let it go to a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not debatable. The question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to have an understanding that no other legislative business shall be considered to-night after this deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is right.

Mr. HALE. That is right. There is no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the Senator's proposition?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That no other legislative business shall be considered to-day but this deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent that no other legislative business shall be considered to-day but the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that no other business shall be considered to-day other than the general deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. TELLER. No other legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No other legislative business. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. How long does that order last?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To-day.

Mr. HALE. Only to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be

first considered in the reading. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HALE. I hope that Senators, as I said before, perhaps at some expense of personal convenience, will remain here so that we may pass this bill to-night. We can do it in two hours. But if Senators leave the Chamber and leave us without a quorum, any single Senator can stop the bill; and I have just been admonished that a Senator will call for a quorum, if a quorum disappears. So I am not asking too much or trespassing too much on Senators when I ask them to stay here until the bill is passed.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to know what is the necessity for passing the bill to-night. It is now after 5 o'clock. What is the urgent necessity?

Mr. HALE. I will tell the Senator.

Mr. HAWLEY. That we may be able to adjourn next Wednesday.

Mr. HALE. Just as I stated last night, there is a great pressure in the Senate for other business. If we can pass this bill to-night, it will go into conference, and then all the appropriation bills, including this measure, will be out of the way of the Senate, and other business, important bills and all other bills, will come up, the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriation bills being out of the way.

We thought it was a good thing for the general business, because there are a good many measures that ought to pass outside of this bill, and as soon as we are out of the way, as two or three days will be needed for conferences, that time will be taken with other bills. If the bill goes over to-day, it will come up to-morrow, and it may take half of the day to-morrow. It is not a matter affecting me, but I am willing to stay and pass the bill to-night, so that we will be out of the way.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the Senator is opening the way for political action?

Mr. HALE. No; not for political action.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Rhode Island says to me, "Yes."

Mr. ALDRICH. For any kind of action.

Mr. HALE. I am willing to leave that to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I am rather under the impression that the other side has the floor preempted for the balance of the session, if we are to adjourn on Wednesday next.

Mr. HALE. I do not think so. I think the Senator will have a fair chance.

Mr. TELLER. If they have, we will give them notice that they can not hold it.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know about that. I think there is great tenacity of purpose on the other side.

Mr. HALE. Seriously, there are a good many important measures on the Calendar that ought to be taken up, and we want to get this appropriation bill out of their way.

Mr. ALLEN. Four days of the time of the Senate within the last week or the last ten days have been consumed by the other side of the Chamber in making partisan political speeches for distribution this fall for campaign purposes. They were made for no other purpose except to deceive and mislead unsuspecting voters, and I think those speeches need a careful analysis and an explanation given before the Senate adjourns.

I do not think it is a matter of life and death that we shall adjourn on Wednesday next. While I do not propose to obstruct this bill or any other bill, I do not feel that it should be railroaded through the Senate to-night or at any other time for the mere accommodation of the political claptrap that is to follow. We have stayed here now until after 5 o'clock, and there is no reason why we should not meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning and take up this bill and read it through and pass it. I do not suppose it will lead to much debate.

Mr. TELLER. Let us go on to-night.

Mr. HALE. We can finish it to-night very easily.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope there will be no objection to going on with this bill to-night. It is in the interest of the public business that the bill shall be disposed of. As the Senator from Maine has suggested, it may be of some personal inconvenience to Senators to remain here for an hour or two, but I hope by general consent it may be done, and to-morrow and Monday and Tuesday can be devoted to the consideration of measures on the Calendar that ought to be considered before we adjourn. I think we can adjourn easily by the middle of the week, and it is a good thing to have an early adjournment if possible. I hope that nobody will object, and I trust my friend from Nebraska will not interpose any objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. I am very much gratified to know the views of the Senator from Arkansas, but very sorry indeed to disagree with him. I do not think there is any necessity for adjourning this session of Congress on Wednesday next. While I do not propose to do anything to lengthen the session, while I am extremely anxious to get home and to get away from this climate, I do not think the public business should be whistled down the wind without consideration simply to meet the convenience of Senators.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator any objection to our starting on the bill now and going as far as we can with it to-day?

Mr. ALLEN. It is started now, and it is after 5 o'clock. Why not adjourn and come here to-morrow morning at 11 and take up the bill?

Mr. HAWLEY. I call for the regular order.

Mr. ALLEN. We can probably take it up to-morrow and pass it in an hour or two, and why should we stay here until 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening to-day?

Mr. HALE. The Senator is an old legislator here, and of course he knows how these things run at the end of a session. I think he must feel that it is not unreasonable. We have a very full Senate here and we can utilize a couple of hours now and dispose of this bill. Of course the Senator can stop it, and nobody knows how much time will be used up to-morrow.

Mr. ALLEN. Here is a bill embracing appropriations to the amount of \$10,000,000—

Mr. HALE. It is a very small deficiency bill.

Mr. ALLEN. And the Senator proposes to run it through the Senate, I suppose, skipping half of it in the reading, as is the custom here, within an hour.

Mr. HALE. Let me tell the Senator that there has not been so small a deficiency bill reported for ten years as is the case this year. It is almost the smallest deficiency appropriation bill that I have ever reported. There are no big items in it. It is only cleaning up debts and audited accounts from the Departments that citizens have been waiting for, and that they are waiting for now, and it is paying the debts of the Government in a small way. There is less controversy in the bill than any deficiency bill I ever saw passed. Hundreds of men, humble men, are waiting for the payment of their audited accounts that have come in from the Treasury, and those comprehend nineteen-twentieths of the items in this bill. I hope the Senator will not interfere. Of course he can test the sense of the Senate by moving to adjourn, but I hope he will not do that.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to interfere, and I am not going to interfere—

Mr. CULLOM. Then let us go ahead with the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me to make an observation, the Senator seems to favor the necessity of the passage of the bill on the ground that it provides for the payment of a great many little accounts. That is true. We have a great many millions of dollars of accounts that are equally as meritorious as the items in this bill, and no provision whatever has been made for an appropriation to pay them.

I think, Mr. President, I am safe in saying that the Government owes \$100,000,000 of honest claims that no steps have been taken to pay, and I dare say if a Senator should rise here and offer one of those claims as an amendment to this bill the Senator from Maine would be upon his feet with lightning-like speed to raise an objection under Rule XVI and prevent it from being incorporated in the bill.

Now, I do not want to obstruct this measure, and I shall not do so. I want to appeal to the Senator from Maine not to press this bill to-night. It came in here only yesterday. Nobody has had an opportunity to read it, other measures being before the Senate. Let us adjourn until 11 o'clock in the morning, and having had an opportunity in the meantime to read all the provisions of the bill, we will then take it up and finish it.

Mr. HALE. Let me say, in answer to that appeal, I can not do that. I should be running counter to the sentiments of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I have seen the Senator in that attitude before.

Mr. HALE. This matter came up last night, and it was stated here on the floor that if we could have to-day—and all Senators understood we could have to-day—we would pass the only two remaining appropriation bills. This is the last one.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose we do pass it, then what?

Mr. HALE. Then we are out of the way.

Mr. ALLEN. Then what have you got to do?

Mr. HALE. We are out of the way.

Mr. ALLEN. Out of the way of what?

Mr. HALE. We can take up the Calendar and take up important bills; take up everything the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator is interested in.

Mr. CULLOM. Or make speeches.

Mr. HALE. Or Senators can make speeches if they choose. I am trying to get out of the way. Of course if the Senator wants he can test the sense of the Senate. I will submit to that. He can make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator knows very well that there is scarcely a bill on the Calendar that can be passed at this hour that will pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALE. Senators have bills on the Calendar that they expect to get through.

Mr. ALLEN. That has been the experience heretofore.

Mr. HALE. Then let us take the sense of the Senate. I hope

the Senator will let us go along with the bill at this time, because certainly that is the feeling of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no power to obstruct the bill, I suppose. Whatever the committee in charge of the bill may say about it I suppose is a finality, and nobody has a right to open his mouth in protest without incurring the displeasure of that august organization. It has been my pleasure, Mr. President, through my life to incur the ridicule and the offense of a great many good people, a great many organizations, and I do not know but that I can stand this in addition to what I have already received.

There is not a modicum of good sense in pushing this bill to-night. There is no reason why we should sit here until 7 or 8 o'clock or later than that and push through a bill that carries with it millions of dollars of public money, when Senators have not had an opportunity to read it and will hear it when read in an imperfect and disjointed way for the first time at the Clerk's desk. We know what the custom is here. There is no use of secreting the fact. The reading clerk on his own volition or on the suggestion of some person is in the habit of jumping and skipping paragraphs and pages of appropriation bills carrying millions of dollars, and they are never read, never considered, and I presume the same practice will be followed in the reading of this bill.

Now, after a session lasting from 11 o'clock until, practically, half past 5 o'clock, without an opportunity to read or study this bill or its provisions, the committee propose to take it up and push it through within an hour, that the way may be cleared for the consideration of other business that may be called up from the Calendar. I say to the Senator from Maine he can not make any progress in pushing this bill to-night. The bill can not pass to-night and be given the consideration that it is entitled to. Why not save time and adjourn at this hour until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, giving every Senator an opportunity to take a copy of the bill to his office or his house and study its provisions and come in in the morning and determine what ought to be done? There is no reason why we should not do that.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that this bill largely consists of audited accounts of the different Departments. It is rather a matter of routine, with the exception of two or three items. Why not see if we can not make some progress to-night? And if we get too tired, after a while we can adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. For myself, I should like to have some opportunity to look into the bill. I observe in glancing through it, as I could divide my attention between it and the bill which has just passed, that there are several provisions which, in my judgment, ought to be modified materially before they are permitted to pass. Yet the Senator in charge of the bill does not propose to give any person the slightest opportunity to examine it.

Mr. HALE. This bill has been here for days. When I reported it days and days ago I announced that as soon as the sundry civil bill was passed I would call it up.

Mr. ALLEN. It was reported only a few days ago.

Mr. HALE. Now the Senator is declaring that he will not let the public business proceed. I hope the Senate will stand by this proposition, and let the Senator, if he wants, make a motion to adjourn; test the sense of the Senate as to how it feels about this matter. Of course that is his right. He and I are fellow-members of the Senate. It is not a question of my bill that I want to have passed; I am seeking to pass a bill that is not thrust upon the Senate. It has been here for a week. Everybody has had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to correct the Senator from Maine. The bill was reported on the 29th day of May.

Mr. HALE. That is almost a legislative week.

Mr. ALLEN. Two or three days ago.

Mr. HALE. It was reported on Tuesday, and now it is Friday. I am seeking its passage not for my own convenience. I sacrificed some matters that have been of great personal comfort to me to be here and have this bill passed to-day. Now, if the Senate wants to adjourn, the bill will go over until to-morrow morning. Let the Senator make a motion to adjourn and see how Senators feel about it.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to make a motion of that kind. I want the Senator from Maine to make the motion.

Mr. HALE. I can not. I want to go on with the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want—

Mr. HALE. The Senator can keep on talking, of course, if he desires.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is protesting. I shall stand by him, and possibly this side may, until a later hour.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator does not know how interesting this bill is. It is important. Let me read a few items as a sample:

For vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings, \$19.51.
For suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, \$1.05.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, \$46.58.
For contingent expenses, Independent Treasury, 10 cents.
For contingent expenses, office of Director of the Mint, 60 cents.
For support of Crows—subsistence, \$3,381.61.

I suppose those are Indians.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the amounts just read by the Senator represent about the value of his remarks, but possibly that valuation is a little high.

Mr. TURNER. I hope the Senator from Maine will not go beyond the reading of the bill to-day, at any rate. I have some matters that I should like to present in the way of amendment.

Mr. HALE. I can do nothing.

Mr. TURNER. I am not prepared to present them to-night.

Mr. ALLEN. I am perfectly willing, if the Senator will permit me, that after the conclusion of the reading of the bill it shall go over. That course will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. TURNER. I wish to make a statement. Understanding that the bill is of the character indicated by the Senator from Maine, providing for the payment of just claims, I offered an amendment providing for the payment of three just claims in my State, which were favorably reported to the Committee on Appropriations by the Committee on Public Lands. I do not find that the Appropriations Committee has taken any notice of them. I desire to have an opportunity to offer evidence in favor of their justice.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will have that opportunity. There are a great many amendments, concerning some of which the papers did not appear before the committee, that are not in the bill. If the Senator or any other Senators have amendments to offer, there will be ample opportunity. The reading of the bill will not take more than an hour.

Mr. TURNER. If the amendments I offered are to be contested by the committee, it will be necessary for me to have some data.

Mr. HALE. I do not suppose they will be contested if they are not subject to a point of order. Certainly I would not undertake to contest them if they come in from the Department. It is always the case on a deficiency bill that there are a great many things that do not get to the committee and yet are brought in from the Department, and perhaps after the committee has had time to consider them they are put on the bill afterwards.

I feel about this matter that it is not a question as to what I shall do. A single Senator appeals to me to give way and to let the bill go over, when for the last twenty-four hours everybody has understood that we would take the bill up and try to get it through to-day. I am appealed to now by every Senator about me here and by Senators on the other side to go on with the bill. It must rest with the Senator himself whether he will let the bill go on.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not obstructing the bill.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to do that.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can do it if he chooses. I can not help that.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to do that. I want to appeal to the reason of the Senator from Maine that, under the circumstances, we shall adjourn now until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. I can not consent to that.

Mr. ALLEN. And take up this bill in regular order to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. I can not consent to that, because of the general understanding in the Senate. We can go on to-night, and we can finish the bill. We could have finished it by this time if the Senator had not intervened.

Mr. ALLEN. That may have been the understanding with four or five Senators. I do not know to what extent it was the understanding. It has not reached this corner of the Chamber.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can test that by a motion to adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not like to test the sense of the Senate by a motion to adjourn. I know of several ways by which I could prevent the passage of this bill if I wanted to do so. I do not want to prevent the passage of the bill. I do not like to be forced into this proceeding. I do not like this idea of coercion. I do not like this assumption of superiority and dictatorial methods and the manner in which these measures are presented. The Senator from Maine seems to think that if he wants anything it is an offense, if it does not amount to the dignity of a crime, for any man to protest against it, and that that man is to be visited with his displeasure.

There are important items on this bill that I do not want to see adopted to-night, before I have had an opportunity to look into them. I have not had that opportunity. I am not asking to-night that which has not been uniformly accorded to a Senator asking it in this Chamber at this hour of the night, that we shall pass over a measure until the next legislative day, especially when I am perfectly willing to concede that the Senate shall meet, as it has done for the last few days, one hour earlier than usual.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will consent to let the bill be read, and then, if necessary, we can come to an agreement to adjourn without any final action, but simply to get through with that much.

Mr. ALLEN. If we get through with the reading, we will be no nearer a conclusion than now.

Mr. TILLMAN. We will have saved at least an hour.

Mr. ALLEN. You are then confronted with the same difficulty, whether you adjourn or not. If the Senate will agree, after the reading of the bill, to adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock, I think we can reach an understanding that it shall go over without action upon the amendments that are contested. I submit that proposition to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. TILLMAN. In view of the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], in regard to having some amendments that he wishes to propose and that are not contested, I suppose there will be no occasion for any further postponement of a vote, unless discussion arises on some of the other amendments that may be proposed.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection if we can go through with the bill and take up the committee amendments and consider amendments as they are offered, so that we shall get through with the main substance of the bill, which we can do in a short time. Then if a Senator has any matters that he wants reserved, and wants the bill to go over until to-morrow, I will consent to that, because that will practically do the business the Senate has in hand, and we shall not take up any time to-morrow. I am entirely willing to agree to that.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator agree after the bill has been read and the Senate committee amendments that are uncontested have been adopted, he will then move to adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock, without taking the bill out of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. HALE. Yes. I should like to consider amendments that Senators now are ready to propose; and in view of something being in the bill that the Senator wants, perhaps, to contest, and from which he does not want to be shut off by final action to-night, I am entirely willing that when we get through with the reading of the bill and the consideration of the committee amendments, the bill shall go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLEN. And there shall be action on amendments that are not contested.

Mr. HALE. And any other amendments that are ready to be offered. Then I shall be entirely willing that the bill shall go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is going altogether too far. After we act on amendments that are not contested, amendments that are acceptable, why not adjourn then?

Mr. HALE. All right.

Mr. ALLEN. Then, I suppose, there is a distinct understanding that we shall go through the bill now, read it through, and if there are contested amendments they are to be passed over, and when we reach the end of the bill and the committee amendments that are not contested, we shall adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. That is not very bad, because that disposes of the large part of the bill. If there are any contested amendments, I am entirely willing that they shall go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, and read to line 9 on page 2.

Mr. HALE. There are some corrections that, as committee amendments, I want to make as we go along. On page 2, line 7, I move to strike out "\$24,923.26" and insert "\$25,053.21."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 2, lines 12 and 13, I move to strike out the amount named, "\$34,444.49" and insert "\$34,968.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 23 on page 2.

Mr. HALE. In line 23 on page 2 I move to strike out "\$21,946.78" and insert "\$24,497.21."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 3 on page 3.

Mr. HALE. I move the amendment, in line 2 on page 3, which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, after the date "1898," it is proposed to strike out "\$5,053.15," and insert "\$5,119.71;" so as to make the clause read:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation for "Contingent expenses, United States consulates," for the fiscal year 1898, \$5,119.71.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, under the sub-head "Foreign intercourse," on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

To pay Edward Bedloe, late consul-general at Canton, China, the amount of salary still unpaid from December 8, 1898, to January 15, 1900, at the rate of \$3,500 per annum, \$3,097.41.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 23, to insert:

To pay Ramon O. Williams, late consul-general at Havana, the amounts necessarily expended by him for clerk hire in excess of his allowances between July 1, 1892, and June 5, 1896, \$2,222.08.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

To pay Joseph A. Springer, vice-consul-general at Havana, the amounts necessarily expended by him for clerk hire in excess of his allowances between October, 1892, and June 30, 1895, \$200.54.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 9, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of State to carry into effect the act approved August 3, 1894, entitled "An act for the disposal of the accretions of the Virginus indemnity fund," \$2,288.03.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 5, line 4, the amount there should be changed to "\$1,432.82."

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,032.15" and insert "\$1,432.82;" so as to make the clause read:

For the fiscal year 1900, \$1,432.82.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In line 13 on page 5 I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. GALLINGER in the chair]. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 13, after the date "1900," it is proposed to strike out "\$1,997.98," and insert "\$3,152.78;" so as to make the clause read:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Treasury Department: File holders and cases," for the fiscal year 1903, \$3,152.78.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 5, after line 14, to insert:

For purchase of file holders and file cases, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 16, to insert:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For paper, including transportation, salaries of register, two counters, five watchmen, one laborer, and expenses of officer detailed from the Treasury as superintendent, \$14,883.20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 11, to insert:

Vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings: For vaults, safes, and locks, and repairs to the same, for all public buildings under control of the Treasury Department, exclusive of personal services, except for work done by contract, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "two;" so as to make the clause read:

Collecting the revenue from customs: To defray the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs, being additional to the permanent appropriation for this purpose, for the fiscal year 1900, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 18, to insert:

Refund to John W. Bero: To refund to John W. Bero, deputy collector of customs, port of Plattsburg, N. Y., the amount of certain public moneys forwarded by him August 1, 1899, by registered mail from Hogsburg, N. Y., to Plattsburg, N. Y., which money was taken from the safe in the post-office at Rouse Point, N. Y., on the occasion of a burglary committed therein on the night of August 2, 1899, the sum so stolen having been made good to the United States by said John W. Bero, \$23.60.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 4, to insert:

Refund of fine, steamer *Palatia*: To refund to the collector of customs at New York, N. Y., for payment by him to the person or persons entitled to receive the same, the sum of \$50, being the amount of a fine imposed in the case of Scheine Gluckmann, a passenger on the Hamburg-American steamer *Palatia* on or about January 14, 1900, since remitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, the original amount having been covered into the Treasury prior to said remission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 19, to insert:

Payment to Capt. B. Tellefsen: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Capt. B. Tellefsen, master of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, for expenses incurred by him in consequence of a violation of Article XIII of the treaty of commerce and navigation of the year 1827, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden and Norway, by an officer of the city of Boston, Mass., on the 18th day of July, 1892, \$993.96.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to insert:

Payment to owners of schooner *J. R. Carroll*: For payment to the owner or owners of the schooner *J. R. Carroll* as compensation for damages sustained by said schooner in consequence of a collision with the steam launch attached to the U. S. S. *A. D. Bache* in Eastern Bay on the night of October 4 and 5, 1899, \$100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

Payment to heirs of Diedney Read: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the legal representatives of Diedney Read, deceased, \$450, being

the amount appropriated to said Diedney Read under the name of Dildeny Read by the "Act making appropriations for the payment of claims reported allowed by the Commissioners of Claims under the act of Congress of March 3, 1871, and acts amendatory thereof," approved June 14, 1880, and still remaining in the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "Capt. H. C. Newcomer, \$246.88;" in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "ten" and insert "sixteen;" in line 25, after the word "cents," to insert "Maj. W. H. Bixby, \$168.56; Maj. Charles F. Powell, \$56.30; Lieut. Col. Charles J. Allen, \$9.88;" and on page 14, line 7, before the word "cents," to strike out "one hundred and sixty-six dollars and forty" and insert "six hundred and forty-seven dollars and two," so as to make the clause read:

Credit in accounts of certain officers, Corps of Engineers: Authority is hereby granted to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to allow and credit in the accounts of certain officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army amounts standing against them on the books of the Treasury as follows: Capt. William E. Craighill, \$16.30; Capt. C. H. McKinsstry, \$45; Capt. H. C. Newcomer, \$246.88; Maj. Charles W. Raymond, \$61.48; Maj. Thomas L. Casey, \$21.32; Maj. H. M. Adams, \$2,618.40; Maj. E. H. Ruffner, \$40.80; Maj. R. L. Hoxie, \$44.67; Maj. C. McD. Townsend, \$31.92; Maj. W. H. Bixby, \$168.56; Maj. Charles F. Powell, \$56.30; Lieut. Col. Charles J. Allen, \$9.88; and Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, \$288.51; in all, \$3,647.02.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Engraving and Printing," on page 15, after line 20, to insert:

For rent of office now occupied by agent of the Post-Office Department to supervise the distribution of stamps of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, at a rental of \$50 per month, \$600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead of "Public buildings," on page 19, after line 9, to insert:

Public building, Sioux City, Iowa: The sum of \$3,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriations for said building is hereby authorized to be used for the installation therein of a tower clock.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Fish Commission," on page 20, line 18, to increase the appropriation for completion of the fish-cultural station of the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries at Edenton, N. C., from \$6,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 17, after the word "balance," to insert "amounting to \$1,275.17;" so as to read:

That the unexpended balance, amounting to \$1,275.17, of the appropriation of \$195,300 for "Miscellaneous expenses, Fish Commission, 1899," made in the sundry civil act approved July 1, 1898, is hereby made available for payment of liabilities incurred during the fiscal year 1899, etc.

Mr. HALE. On page 23, line 19, I wish to offer an amendment, and I will state that these changes are in consequence of additional estimates which have come in since the bill has been reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 23, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

For completing an index of the laws respecting the municipal government of the District of Columbia, \$300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 24, after line 24, to insert:

To pay W. B. Moses & Sons the difference in price between bill as rendered and paid, for blueboards for the Western High School, and that for which bill should have been rendered, \$175.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move an amendment on page 26, line 17, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, line 17, after the word "session," it is proposed to insert "and on page 3 of Senate Document No. 413;" and in the same line to strike out "\$10,572.33" and insert "\$10,592.48;" so as to make the clause read:

Judgments: For the payments of judgments, including costs, against the District of Columbia, set forth on page 9, House Document No. 642, of this session, and on page 3 of Senate Document No. 413, \$10,592.48.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 6, on page 27.

Mr. HALE. On page 27, after line 6, I move to insert what I send to the Secretary's desk. These are additional estimates which have come in since the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

Writs of lunacy: For amount required to pay the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia fees in lunacy cases, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 18, page 27.

Mr. HALE. After line 18, on page 27, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. After line 18, on page 27, it is proposed to insert:

For repairs to buildings, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Military establishment," on page 31, after line 7, to insert:

For the reimbursement of necessary transportation and traveling expenses, including railroad fare, sleeping-car fare, transfers, meals, and lodgings en route or during necessary delays, of nurses employed by the Medical Department of the Army since April 30, 1898, incurred in traveling upon public business from their homes to the places of service and subsequently on changes of station and return to their homes, whose claims may have heretofore been disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury on the ground that the terms of the written contracts made with the nurses did not entitle them to the allowances in question, excepting the 218 claims forwarded by the Quartermaster-General to the Auditor for the War Department on or about February 27, 1899, which have been otherwise provided for, \$4,000: *Provided*, That all other such claims now pending or that may hereafter be presented shall be allowed and paid from the regular appropriations applicable to the payment of transportation and traveling expenses of civilian employees of the Army, in like manner as if the terms of the written contracts entitled the nurses to such allowances; but the amounts allowed shall in no case exceed the amounts authorized by the War Department in regulations governing the matter, nor the amounts stipulated in the written contracts if the latter expressly provide therefor: *And provided further*, That disbursing officers of the Quartermaster's Department who have paid or shall hereafter pay accounts for such expenses shall be given credit for all such payments upon proper vouchers.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 31, at the end of line 7, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 31, at the end of line 7, it is proposed to insert:

To pay the amount found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Transportation of the Army and its supplies for the fiscal year 1898," \$720.96.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 15, on page 37, in the clause making appropriations for the pay of the Navy.

Mr. HALE. On page 37, line 15, I move to strike out "Habana" and insert "Havana."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 6 on page 40.

Mr. HALE. I move an amendment in line 5, which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. In line 5 on page 40, after the date "1900," it is proposed to strike out "\$765.33" and insert "\$3,046.45;" so as to make the clause read:

For transportation, recruiting, and contingent, Bureau of Navigation, 1900, \$3,046.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move to amend, on page 40, line 9, by inserting what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

For outfits for naval apprentices, Bureau of Navigation, 1898 and 1899, \$8,153.98.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. After line 14 on the same page I move to insert the three clauses which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. After line 14, on page 40, it is proposed to insert:

For contingent, Bureau of Ordnance, 1898 and 1899, \$523.
For contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, 1898, \$411.55.
For repairs of barracks, Marine Corps, 1898 and 1899, \$292.51.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. The total in line 17, on page 40, should be corrected so as to read "\$17,749.19."

The SECRETARY. In line 17, on page 40, it is proposed to increase the total appropriation for "General account of advances" from "\$6,082.03" to "\$17,749.19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and continued to the end of line 16, on page 41.

Mr. HALE. After line 16, on page 41, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

To pay amount found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Transportation, recruiting, and contingent, Bureau of Navigation," \$4,819.77.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 2, page 45.

Mr. HALE. On page 45, at the end of line 2, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

To pay to the Cleveland Steamship Company damages done to the merchant steamer *M. A. Hanna* by the U. S. S. *Michigan*, on October 15, 1899, by means of a collision with said steamer, \$327.57.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous, Navy," on page 45, after line 2, to insert:

To reimburse Theodore J. Arms, assistant paymaster in the United States Navy, for the loss which occurred by reason of the robbery of his safe at the United States naval station, San Juan, Porto Rico, March 10, 1899, he having made the same good to the United States, and the said loss having occurred through no fault or negligence on his part, \$2,479.03.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 11, to insert:

Repairs of buildings, Interior Department: For repairs of Interior Department and Pension buildings and of the old Post-Office Department building occupied by the Interior Department, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 15, to insert:

For removal of offices of the Interior Department to the old Post-Office Department building, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 17, to insert:

Contingent expenses, Interior Department: For postage stamps for the Department of the Interior and its bureaus, as required under the Postal Union, to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal Union countries, \$629.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 22, to insert:

Reimbursement of George W. Evans: To reimburse George W. Evans, disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, the amount disallowed in the settlement of his account Repairs of buildings, Department of the Interior, 1899, quarter ended March 31, 1899, on account of payments made by him by direction of the Secretary of the Interior, for cleaning snow from the sidewalks around the several buildings of the Interior Department during the winter of 1899, \$166.75.

Mr. HALE. In line 1, page 46, I move to amend the amendment by striking out "1889" and inserting "1899."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of the line 11, page 46.

Mr. HALE. On page 46, after line 11, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

To pay for electric chandeliers for the corridors and committee rooms of the Senate wing, to replace worn-out and obsolete gas fixtures, \$1,500.

Mr. HALE. After the amendment just adopted, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

To pay for mahogany doors for the Marble Room, President's Room, and room of the Committee on Finance, \$949.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 46, after the amendment just adopted, to insert:

Steam heating and machinery, Senate wing: To pay the Otis Elevator Company for special repairs to Senate elevators, \$202.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 16, before the word "Electric," to strike out "Washington" and insert "Westinghouse;" so as to make the clause read:

Lighting Capitol grounds: To pay the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company for additions and repairs to the switchboard dynamo rooms of the Senate and House, \$1,716.24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 2, to strike out:

To pay to Albert F. Easley, deputy surveyor, for surveying and establishing the exterior and connecting lines of the "Galisteo grant allotments" in Santa Fe County, N. Mex., under contract of November 23, 1896, \$96.88.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 8, page 47.

Mr. HALE. After line 8 on page 47 I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

To pay the necessary expenses of printing the transcript in the case of J. F. Manning & Co. against the Chesapeake and Ohio Telephone Company, No. 19558, in equity, on appeal from the supreme court of the District of Columbia to the court of appeals of said District and to the Supreme Court of the United States, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, said sum to be paid by the Treasurer of the United States upon the certificate of the clerk of the court of appeals and of the Supreme Court of the United States, respectively, certifying that the amount or amounts so to be paid is the actual amount due for such printing.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 47, after the amendment just adopted, to insert:

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Government Hospital for the Insane: For current expenses of the Government Hospital for the Insane: For support, clothing, and treatment in the Government Hospital for the Insane of the insane from the Army and Navy, Marine Corps, Revenue-Cutter Service, and inmates of the National Home for

Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States, who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military or naval service of the United States, who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, \$2,276.53.

Mr. HALE. After the word "indigent," in line 20, I move to insert "for the fiscal year 1899."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 2, to insert:

To pay to Albert F. Easley, deputy surveyor, for surveying and establishing the exterior and connecting lines of the "Galisteo grant allotments" in Santa Fe County, N. Mex., under contract of November 23, 1896, \$96.88.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 25, to insert:

To pay to George E. Boos, manager of the Missoula Publishing Company, Missoula, Mont., for publishing advertisements of three mineral-land lists in 30 issues of said journal from June 7 to July 12, 1898, this amount having been heretofore suspended, but now allowed, \$450.20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to John McMurray, manager of the Recorder, a newspaper published at Anaconda, Mont., as additional allowance for publishing lists of classified mineral lands, such additional allowance being based upon the rates provided for by Department circular of April 13, 1895, \$126.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 13, to insert:

To pay the 12 members of the boards of mineral-land commissioners for the States of Montana and Idaho the balance due them for services during the month of October, 1899, \$216.67 each; in all, \$2,600.04.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 19, to insert:

For payments and reimbursements to the parties named, and in the amounts specified, respectively, on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 361 of the present session, under the title, "General Land Office," \$327.07.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 50, to insert:

To reimburse William A. Richards, late United States surveyor-general for Wyoming, for losses incurred by him through a cloud-burst upon July 6, 1891, near Fort Washakie, upon the Shoshone Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, while in the discharge of his duties as surveyor-general examining a public survey, under section 2223 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and the special instructions of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$318.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 50, after line 10, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Appraisal and sale of abandoned military reservations" for the fiscal year 1898, \$25.09.

Mr. HALE. After the amendment just adopted I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

For the fiscal year 1900, \$1.66.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 9 on page 52.

Mr. HALE. At the bottom of page 51, line 23, the sum should be struck out and the words "two thousand one hundred and twenty-nine dollars and nine cents" inserted.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out \$185.98 in line 23, page 51, and insert \$2,129.09, so as to read:

For the fiscal year 1900, \$2,129.09.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. At the top of the next page the amount in line 1 should be struck out and the words "three thousand two hundred and twelve dollars and seventy-three cents" inserted.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, on page 52, line 1, the words "two thousand nine hundred and eighty-three dollars and eighteen cents," and insert "three thousand two hundred and twelve dollars and seventy-three cents," so as to read:

For the fiscal year 1899, \$3,212.73.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In line 4, page 52, I move to strike out the amount and insert "\$1,025.86."

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, in line 4, page 52, to strike out "\$913.67" and insert "\$1,025.86;" so as to read.

For the fiscal year 1898, \$1,025.86.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. After line 9 on page 52 I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "vaccination of Indians," \$53.

Mr. HALE. After the amendment just adopted I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "support of Quapaws, education," \$12.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of

the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 54, after line 2, to insert:

To pay to the estate of Hopiahtubby, deceased, the amount of claim allowed as indemnity under treaty with the Choctaws and Chickasaws of 1855 on account of horses stolen by Comanche Indians in 1866, as per award of the Secretary of the Interior and Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, dated November 2, 1899, \$2,061.25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 2, to insert:

For the following, as fully set forth in House Document No. 677 of the present session, namely:

To pay for water rent at the Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., \$250.

The proper accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized to readjust the accounts of the special disbursing agent of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes for the first fractional third quarter, 1899, and allow so much of voucher No. 31 in said quarter as may have been paid for advertising, not to exceed \$53.17.

For support and civilization of the Makah Indians, Washington, including pay of employees, \$900.

For support, civilization, and instruction of the Klamaths, Modocs, and other Indians of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., including pay of employees, \$1,000.

For support and civilization of the confederated tribes and bands in middle Oregon, and for pay of employees, \$500.

For support and civilization of the Walla Walla, Cayuse, and Umatilla tribes, Oregon, including pay of employees, \$300.

For support and civilization of the Yakimas and other Indians at said agency, including pay of employees, \$350.

For general incidental expenses of the Indian service in Utah, including traveling expenses of agents, support and civilization of Indians at the Uintah Valley and Ouray agencies, \$800.

To pay for lands purchased for Seminoles in Florida, \$265.75, to be paid from a balance on the books of the Treasury, under the title of "Homesteads for Seminoles in Florida."

To pay those Indians who served the United States under Gen. O. O. Howard in the late war with Joseph's band of the Nez Perces tribe of Indians as scouts, couriers, and messengers, referred to in article 10 of the agreement of May 10, 1893, with the Nez Perces Indians, ratified by the act of Congress approved August 15, 1894, which claims are fully enumerated in House Document No. 552, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, \$4,752.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Twelfth Census," on page 57, after line 7, to insert:

To pay Mrs. Ella M. Shell, widow of G. W. Shell, deceased, for services rendered by her husband as census supervisor for the fourth census district of South Carolina, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 10, page 60.

Mr. HALE. On page 60, line 8, I move to strike out "five" and insert "eight."

The SECRETARY. On page 60, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "eight," so as to read:

For the fiscal year 1899, \$849.06.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 60, after line 10, to insert:

Compromise of suit: To enable the Attorney-General to make settlement of a suit of T. F. Townsley against the United States pending in the circuit court for the district of Washington for damages claimed for alleged breach of contract for carrying reindeer between certain Siberian and Alaskan ports, \$1,718.88, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 14, to strike out:

To pay Frank D. Allen, late United States district attorney for the district of Massachusetts, for services rendered the United States in the United States circuit court of appeals, \$1,900.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator from Maine will allow the amendment to be disagreed to. It has been twice put on in the Senate and lost in conference with the House. Now the House has put it in. It is an entirely just claim, and I hope the Senator will agree that we may disagree to it.

Mr. HALE. We struck it out because the report of the Comptroller—the last report we had—reported against it on the ground that it was above the maximum compensation. I think the Senator's colleague—I have not had an opportunity—has looked the matter up and has the subsequent action.

Mr. HOAR. I have here a letter from the Comptroller of the Treasury, stating that it was a mistake. This is a claim on the part of the district attorney of Massachusetts for service in the court of appeals, rendered before 1896, by direction of the Attorney-General. In 1896 a law was passed providing that these services should be rendered as a part of the district-attorney's ordinary duties.

But the committee, as I understand, recommended striking out this clause under the impression that these services had been rendered since that time. The Comptroller, however, writes that they were rendered before. Then the question came up whether they were to be included in the district attorney's maximum, but the Attorney-General and the Supreme Court of the United States have both held that they are not included in this maximum. The Comptroller, who had disallowed the claim, now writes a letter to

the Secretary saying that his decision was erroneous and it ought to have been allowed. I will read one sentence from his letter.

This construction, so far as it relates to services of district attorneys in the circuit courts of appeal, was erroneous (decisions above cited)—

That is the decision of the Attorney-General—

and a large number of claims not finally settled at the time of the rendition of the decisions cited, although presented and approved by the Attorney-General exactly as worthy accounts of Mr. Allen, have since been recast and paid, without reference to the fact as to whether the claimant had or had not received his maximum compensation.

So the Comptroller says it ought to be paid.

In addition to the decision of the Attorney-General, the matter has gone to the Supreme Court of the United States, and I will read one sentence from Mr. Justice Brewer's opinion, and it is the opinion of the court:

Whenever the Attorney-General calls upon a district attorney to appear for the Government in a case pending in the court of appeals, he is not directing him in the discharge of his official duties as district attorney, but is employing him as special counsel. The duties so performed are not performed by him as district attorney, but by virtue of the special designation and employment by the Attorney-General, and the compensation which he may receive is not a part of his compensation as district attorney or limited by the maximum prescribed therefor. It seems to us that this is the clear import of the statutes, and we have no difficulty in agreeing with the court of appeals in its opinion upon this question.

Now, all the other district attorneys have been paid in accordance with that provision, and Mr. Allen has not been paid. The Senate has twice passed a special bill for paying him. The House put it into the deficiency appropriation bill, and I hope the committee will allow the provision to stand.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to, which will leave the clause in the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 61, after line 18, to insert:

Court of appeals, District of Columbia: For additional amount as salary of the reporter of said court, \$500, one-half of which shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 3, after the word "for," to insert "all compensation of counsel and;" in line 4, before the word "prosecution," to strike out "further," and in the same line, after the word "prosecution," to insert "to final conclusion;" so as to make the clause read:

Weil and La Abra cases: To enable the Attorney-General to give any additional compensation he may deem proper to counsel for services in the cause of the United States against La Abra Silver Mining Company, finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States at the present term of said court, and for all compensation of counsel and fees and expenses in the prosecution to final conclusion of the suit of the United States against Alice Weil and others, in which an appeal has been allowed by the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States from the judgment of that court in favor of the United States, \$10,000, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 23 on page 65.

Mr. HALE. On page 65, after line 23, I move to insert:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Fees of district attorney for southern district of New York, United States courts," \$2,441.24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "United States courts," on page 66, line 12, after the word "bailiffs," to insert "and criers;" and in line 13, before the word "in," to insert "bailiffs and one crier;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of bailiffs and criers, not exceeding three bailiffs and one crier in each court, except in the southern district of New York: *Provided*, That all persons employed under section 715 of the Revised Statutes shall be deemed to be in actual attendance when they attend upon the order of the courts: *And provided further*, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 14, to insert:

For the support of the United States Penitentiary at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: For subsistence, including supplies for prisoners, warden, deputy warden, and superintendent of industries, tobacco for prisoners, kitchen and dining-room furniture and utensils; and for farm and garden seeds and implements, and for purchase of ice, if necessary, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 14 on page 69.

Mr. HALE. On page 69, lines 13 and 14, I move to strike out "\$9,222.41" and insert "\$10,574.01."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 13 on page 70.

Mr. HALE. On page 70, in line 12, after the words "six hundred and forty-two," I move to insert "and Senate Document numbered 413."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move to strike out "\$159,038.13" and insert "\$159,061.03," on page 70, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to page 71, line 7.

Mr. HALE. In line 7, after the words "six hundred and forty-two," I move to insert "and Senate Document numbered 413."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move to change the amount in line 9 by striking out "\$47,767.49" and inserting "\$47,833.41."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In line 12 I move to insert, after the words "six hundred and forty-two," the words "and Senate Document numbered 413." These are subsequent estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move to change the total by striking out "\$6,085.39" and inserting "\$6,102.43," in line 16, on page 71.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 25.

Mr. HALE. In line 22, after the words "six hundred and forty-two," I move to insert "and Senate Document No. 413."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In lines 24 and 25 I move to strike out "\$1,478,328.12" and insert "\$1,478,532.77."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 72, line 2, I move to strike out "\$1,062.83" and insert "\$1,072.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 72, after line 2, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

For additional amount for rent of building occupied by the Bureau of Animal Industry, \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 5, to insert:

For additional amount for rent of building occupied by the Division of Chemistry, \$1,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 72, after line 9, to insert:

SENATE.

To reimburse NATHAN B. SCOTT, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, as full and final compensation for all expenses necessarily incurred by him in defense of his title to his seat in the Senate, \$2,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 15, to insert:

To reimburse John T. McGraw and other remonstrants contesting the seat of NATHAN B. SCOTT, as a Senator from the State of West Virginia, for all expenses in full and final payment thereof incurred by them in such contest, \$2,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 20, to insert:

To pay Mrs. Jennie Pelton Hayward, widow of the late Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, Senator-elect from the State of Nebraska, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 23, to insert:

To pay Horace C. Reed, clerk to the Committee on Rules of the Senate, for preparing, under the resolution of the Senate of March 2, 1899, an edition of the Senate Manual, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 2, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the persons who performed the work of preparing and arranging the indexes to all the reports of the Secretaries of the Senate, under resolution of March 3, 1899, \$2,000, which sum may be expended as additional pay or compensation to any officer or employee of the United States, and to be paid only upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 11, to insert:

To pay for services rendered to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico in preparing the document entitled "Organic Acts for the Territories of the United States, with notes thereon; also appendixes comprising other matters relating to the government of the Territories," compiled by direction of said committee and authorized by Senate resolution of February 2, 1900, \$300, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairman of said committee to do said work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 20, to insert:

To pay Hawkins Taylor, assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Relations, for extra services, including compilation of the reports of said committee, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 23, to insert:

The Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to pay to William Hayward, as clerk to Hon. M. L. Hayward, deceased, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska, from March 9 to December 5, 1899, from the appropriations for salaries of officers, clerks, and employees of the Senate for the fiscal years 1899 and 1900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 6, to insert:

The Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to pay to William T. Bauskett, as clerk to Hon. JAMES P. TALIAFERRO, a Senator from the State of Florida, from April 25, to December 3, 1899, from the appropriations for salaries of officers, clerks, and employees of the Senate for the fiscal years 1899 and 1900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 13, to insert:

To reimburse the official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the

Senate for expenses incurred from March 4, 1899, to March 4, 1900, for clerk hire and other extra clerical services, \$3,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 18, to insert:

To pay to the persons who performed the work of arranging and preparing the Index of Private Claims introduced during the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses, under Senate resolution of June 10, 1898, \$3,600, being the balance due under said resolution, to be paid only upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate of the Fifty-fifth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 3, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate who were borne on the rolls of the Senate, including the police rolls, December 31, 1899, and who were not borne on said rolls at the close of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, a sum equal to one month's pay at the rate of compensation paid to them at the time of their resignation or discharge, and a sufficient sum for this purpose is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made hereunder to any officer or employee who was re-employed in the service of the Senate within the period named.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee and of the Senate to an amendment that ought to be put into that clause of the bill for the purpose of rendering equal justice to the gentlemen who were discharged from the service of the Senate. The gentlemen came here, of course, under the appointment they had, and they expected naturally that they would be retained until the end of the session; but at all events they were finally discharged, some of them from the service of the Senate and others who were discharged in like manner have been reappointed not to the same places but to places of an inferior salary and inferior grade, and some of them to places of a very low grade. I suppose these gentlemen do not want to have their poverty advertised, but I know the names of a number of them who are very necessitous.

I propose, in line 8, to insert the words "at the same or a larger rate of pay or salary;" so that the paragraph will read:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay—

Mr. HALE. I see no objection to that; at any rate, it will carry it into conference. I will accept that amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. The same amendment would have to come in on line 13, after the word "reemployed."

Mr. HALE. Let the Senator state the words to the clerks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Alabama state his first amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. In line 8, after the word "Congress," I move to insert:

At the same or a larger rate of pay or salary.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. In line 13, after the word "reemployed," I move to insert the same words:

At the same or a larger rate of pay or salary.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 75, after line 14, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, \$34.95.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 17, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 75, after line 20, I move to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 75, after line 20, to insert:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 22, to insert:

For repairing and furnishing Senate committee rooms, \$4,700.

Mr. HALE. In line 23 I move to strike out "For" and to insert the words:

To pay A. H. Davenport for.

So as to read:

To pay A. H. Davenport for repairing and furnishing Senate committee rooms, \$4,700.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 75, after line 24, to insert:

To reimburse L. P. Seibold, custom-house broker, for money expended by him in withdrawing from the custom-house at Washington, D. C., the picture of Pocahontas, which was subsequently presented to and accepted by the Senate of the United States, \$11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 77, after line 21, to insert:

To pay the legal representatives of James Gill amount due him for services as clerk to the late Representative Evan E. Settle from November 1 to November 16, 1899, \$32.17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 14, to insert:

To A. C. Latimer, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 15, to insert:

To R. R. Tolbert, jr., \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for allowances of contestants and contestees for expenses incurred by them in contested-election cases, as audited and recommended by the Committees on Elections, from \$37,355.76 to \$41,355.76.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 9, to insert:

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

For printing and binding for the Supreme Court of the United States, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 87, line 16, after the word "in," I move to insert the word "House;" so as to read: "House Document."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In line 17, after the words "six hundred and seventy-six," I move to insert the words "and Senate Document No. 416."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move to change the amount to "\$466,379," striking out "\$276,655," in line 17, page 87.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to page 88, line 20.

Mr. HALE. On page 88, line 20, after the words "six hundred and sixty-seven," I move to insert "and Senate Document No. 417."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 88, line 21, after the word "appealed," I move to strike out "twenty-five thousand three hundred and fifty-one dollars and seventy cents," and insert "twenty-seven thousand two dollars and eighty-nine cents."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In the next item, on page 89, line 6, after the words "six hundred and thirty-eight," I move to insert the words "and Senate Document No. 414."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 89, line 6, after the amendment just inserted, I move to strike out "\$94,658.59" and insert "\$181,734.92."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at section 2, on page 89, line 11, and continued the reading to the end of the following provision, on page 94, from line 9 to line 17:

For provisions, Navy, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$2,017.88:

Provided, That no part or any one of the claims to which this appropriation is applicable shall be paid therefrom which accrued more than six years prior to the filing of the petition in the Court of Claims upon which the judgment was rendered, which, being affirmed by the Supreme Court, has been adopted by the accounting officers as the basis for the allowance of said claim.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine to what appropriation this proviso applies—whether to the whole four, or only to this appropriation for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts?

Mr. HALE. It applies to provisions.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a statute of limitations. Was it not intended to apply to more than provisions?

Mr. HALE. The Senator can change it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know how to change it, because I do not know whether it is intended to apply to all the claims in this bill or not. I know it is a useful provision, and that the Senator has drafted it on several occasions, but it is very difficult to determine to what appropriations the proviso applies.

Mr. HALE. I will move to amend, in line 11, on page 94, by inserting, after the word "claims," the words "allowed by the Auditor for the Navy Department in this bill." That will cover it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 94, line 11, after the word "claims," it is proposed to insert "allowed by the Auditor for the Navy Department in this bill," so as to make the clause read:

Provided, That no part or any one of the claims allowed by the Auditor for the Navy Department in this bill to which this appropriation is applicable shall be paid therefrom which accrued more than six years prior to the filing of the petition in the Court of Claims upon which the judgment was rendered, which, being affirmed by the Supreme Court, has been adopted by the accounting officers as the basis for the allowance of said claim.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. HALE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk,

which covers certain audited claims sent in by the Departments since the bill was reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 99, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1897 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 415, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Treasury Department: Freight, telegrams, etc., \$34.11.

For contingent expenses, Treasury Department: Stationery, fiscal year 1898, \$1,117.41.

For detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, 52 cents.

For repayment to importers, excess of deposits, \$4.20.

For expenses of Revenue-Cutter Service, 28 cents.

For Life-Saving Service, 6 cents.

For repairs and incidental expenses of light-houses, \$390.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, \$1,048.69.

For pay of two and three year volunteers, \$381.51.

For bounties to volunteers, their widows, and legal heirs, \$421.67.

For bounty under act of July 28, 1868, \$200.

For bounty under act of July 11, 1862, \$100.

For pay of volunteers, \$85.86.

For contingencies of the Army, \$68.18.

For incidental expenses, Quartermaster's Department, \$1,132.80.

For headstones for graves of soldiers, \$28.33.

For construction of military posts on the Yellowstone and Muscleshell rivers, \$25.23.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For pay of the Navy, \$547.18.

For pay of the Marine Corps, \$1.92.

For contingent, Marine Corps, \$15.65.

For contingent, Bureau of Ordnance, \$5.

For provisions, Navy, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$9.90.

For bounty for destruction of enemies' vessels, \$1.63.

For indemnity for lost clothing, \$2,965.50.

For destruction of clothing and bedding for sanitary reasons, \$132.42.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses of land offices, \$12.65.

For surveying the public lands, \$13,007.83.

Indians: For surveying and allotting Indian reservations, \$29.73.

For surveying a portion of Blackfoot Reservation in Montana, \$10.

Pensions: For Army pensions, \$30.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

For salaries, consular service, \$32.50.

For relief and protection of American seamen, \$16.30.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$1.00.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

For pay of bailiffs, etc., United States courts, \$18.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For clerk hire, \$37.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Under the arrangement which was made the committee amendments are completed. Before moving to adjourn, I give notice that I shall call the bill up at the end of the routine morning business to-morrow, and hope that it can be completed in a very short time.

I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 2, 1900, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, June 1, 1900.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 10308) to extend to certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mail with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the House to disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. LOUD, Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, and Mr. GRIGGS.